

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XII. No. 20.] LONDON, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1807. [PRICE 10D.

At the parsons, Tom, halloo, boy,
Worthy off-spring of a shoe-boy.—SWIFT.

737]

[738

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

IRISH TYTHES. —The reader will, perhaps, remember, that I have frequently spoken of the tythes in Ireland as one great source of discontent; and, it would seem, from an article, which appeared in the Morning Chronicle of the 9th instant, and which I am now about to insert, that the protestant gentlemen in that country have been taking some measures, preparatory to an application to parliament for an act to enforce a commutation of the tythes. Of the several duties which the constitution occasionally imposes upon different classes of society, there is no one of greater magnitude than that which the country gentlemen have, in particular emergencies of the state, to discharge, of giving their advice to parliament. The resident gentlemen of Ireland have wisely considered the present aspect of public affairs required from them the exercise of this duty; because the continuance of silence on their part, would be to give countenance to a system of measures, of which they disapprove, and because it is very manifest to all impartial observers, that the safety of Ireland depends upon a speedy termination to this system. Besides, after the late Administration and Parliament having both of them been extinguished for their conduct in respect to Ireland; and after the addresses of numerous public bodies in England, exhibiting their disapprobation of the intended measures of favour towards Ireland; what event can be more natural than declarations on the part of the Irish public, on a subject so completely embracing every thing interesting and dear to Ireland? It is clearly one thing to decide the great question of concession or coercion in managing Ireland in England, and another thing to decide it in Ireland. For though a great cry may be raised in England against concession, still concession must be made, if the men of property of Ireland, who form the Protestant interest, join with the Catholics of Ireland in requiring it. This we consider they have done in a great degree, and we know they wish yet to do so in a still more ex-

tensive manner; for though the Protestant Grand Juries of the counties of Kerry and Galway have alone declared the necessity of Emancipation, several other counties have come to unanimous resolutions, expressive of their opinion, that the measure of A COMMUTATION OF TYTHES is absolutely indispensable to secure internal tranquillity, and ought to be conceded to the people of Ireland. —What is the fair construction to put upon this national exertion? It is this. That the Protestant Gentlemen of Ireland, feeling that the present period is not ripe for urging the complete emancipation of their Catholic fellow subjects, but being anxious to contradict and counteract the bigotry of many in this country, and to shew their disapprobation of coercive measures, adopt a recommendation to Parliament of a commutation of tythes, as that measure which, next to emancipation, will be the most effectual concession that can be made to the Catholics of Ireland. The resolutions of the several counties prove that these are the principles which have actuated the conduct of the Protestant Gentlemen. For in these they declared, that tythes are so great a grievance to the poor, that no measure would be more effectual in preventing insurrections, than a commutation, and all this in direct opposition to every thing that we have of late heard of “no more concessions,” and acts of Parliament to prevent insurrections in Ireland. Nothing can possibly be more illustrative of the liberality and good sense of the Protestant Gentlemen of Ireland, than such language as this. An evil is complained of, insurrection: they proclaim the cause of it to be the grievance, tythes, and advise the remedy, commutation. They do not convene county meetings to return thanks to ministers for their insurrection act and arms act, or for granting additional bulwarks to the Protestant ascendancy; but, at these meetings, they unanimously condemn the principle on which the present administration has been formed, and prove themselves capable of judging of the best mode of governing

“ their own country, by recommending
 “ measures that will attach the great bulk
 “ of the people in fervent loyalty to the
 “ throne and constitution. Our informa-
 “ tion has led us to suppose that a great
 “ change had taken place in the sentiments
 “ of the well-informed Protestants of Ire-
 “ land, with regard to their Catholic fel-
 “ low-subjects. These county meetings
 “ place it beyond a doubt that they are
 “ most liberally inclined towards them; an
 “ event that augurs most favourably of the
 “ future success of the leading advocates
 “ for complete emancipation.”—It will
 be perceived, that this article has a mere
 party purpose in view; but, it announces
 to us the fact, that the *protestant gentlemen*
 of Ireland are for a *commutation of the*
tythes. Let us now see, then, how such a
 measure would operate with respect to the
 people of Ireland, and how far it ought to
 be considered as a “ *concession*” to them.
 —Tythes have been represented as a great
 “ grievance,” and the manner of collecting
 them in Ireland has been, and is, very vex-
 atious. But, what will be the effect of a
 commutation? Will the poor man, who
 cultivates five acres of ground in potatoes,
 yield less in tythe than he does now? Will
 he give less to the parson than he now gives?
 If he does not, it is evident, that he can
 derive no substantial benefits from the pro-
 posed change; and, if he does give less to the
 parson, it is, to me at least, quite certain,
 that he will give more to the land-owner,
 or the land jobber; so that, this commuta-
 tion, whatever may be the effect of it with
 regard to the land owner and the parson,
 will, in no degree whatever, lighten the
 burdens of the potatoe planter. The man-
 ner of collection will, indeed, in case of a
 commutation, be less vexatious; but, when
 land is let to the potatoe-planter, this vex-
 ation is not forgotten by either party; and,
 an allowance, though not expressly, is ac-
 tually made for vexation as well as for tythe,
 especially in a country where the vexation
 is general, and, of course, notorious.—I
 admire, therefore, the “ *patriotism*,”
 which the sage of the Morning Chronicle
 has discovered in the “ *Irish protestant gen-
 tlemen*,” who, as he would have us believe,
 and as he really believes himself, perhaps,
 are endeavouring thus to obtain a *concession*
 to the people of Ireland, but who, if they
 know what they are about, are endeavour-
 ing to take some part of the amount of the
 tythes out of the pockets of the parsons, in
 order to put that amount into their own
 pockets; a most just and suitable return to
 the clergy for that hypocritical up-popery

clamour, in which, to their everlasting
 shame, so many of them had the folly, or
 the wickedness, to join.—Oh, yes! I
 always like to hear of the “ *patriotism*” of
 the “ *protestant gentlemen*” of Ireland!
 Perhaps so keen a set are not to be met
 with upon the face of the whole earth. They
 clamoured without ceasing for the safety of
 the *Church*; but, we now find, that they
 care little about the safety of its ministers,
 when that safety is opposed to their
 own interests.—This proposed commu-
 tation will take exceedingly. The decep-
 tion lies, like that of Pitt's sinking fund, just
 beneath the surface, and that is quite enough
 to insure success with ninety-nine hundredths
 of the mass of mankind, especially when ap-
 parent self-interest comes in to its aid. The
 parson is the man, to whom the farmer im-
 mediately yields his tythes. Take away the
 parson, and, of course, the tythes remain
 with the farmer, and he gains a tenth of the
 whole produce of his farm! But, at the end
 of the year, if he be a yearly tenant, or, at
 the end of his lease, when he comes to take
 his farm again, will not the landlord make
 an addition to the rent equal to the former
 amount of the tythes? Aye, but the vexation
 of having tythes taken up in kind, and hav-
 ing straw carried off the farm. Well, and
 will not the landlord be apprized of this,
 and will he not make the farmer pay for a
 cessation of this vexation, and this imagina-
 ry injury? I remember making some inqui-
 ries upon this subject in France, in the year
 1792, and the information I received from,
 I dare say, not less than a hundred farmers,
 was this, that, in lieu of a tenth of their pro-
 duce yielded to the church, they yielded, af-
 ter the abolition of the tythes, a fifth of their
 produce to the landlord. That this would
 be the natural effect is pretty evident; for,
 the parson collects his tythes under nume-
 rous, and, some of them, great disadvantages.
 If he take them in kind, all the labour of
 gathering them is, upon a general scale, so
 much labour thrown away, because the far-
 mer could gather them, along with his own,
 with no additional expence. Then he is
 subjected to such strict rules in the gather-
 ing; they are scattered about so widely;
 they must necessarily be so mingled in the
 mow; that, take every thing into considera-
 tion, the tythe of any farm, except in very
 singular cases, is not worth to the parson
 much more than half what it is worth to the
 farmer. This the landlord knows; and,
 therefore, take away the tythe, and he will
 make the farmer pay him for it twice as
 much as he has been used to pay the parson.
 Thus, as sure as we are born, would it be

Ireland; and, therefore, this sudden and unexpected effusion of "patriotism," on the part of the "protestant gentlemen" of Ireland, appears to be a scheme for tricking both the parsons and the farmers.—But, did I myself not propose to do something respecting the tythes in Ireland? I did; but, my proposition was not intended to throw more gains into the pockets of the land-owners and land-jobbers. I would still have saddled the land with the expence of maintaining a Clergy of one sort or the other; and, in proportion to the Catholic population, I would have diverted that expence to their ministers, making the Protestant church a compensation in England, by purchasing up the lay impropriations, upon the unalterable condition, that *benefice* and *residence* should, in all cases, be inseparable. This was my scheme. I had no intention to cheat both the clergy and the laity, and call it "patriotism."—Yet, I am half afraid, that this patriotic scheme was the very one which Lords Howick and Henry Petty had upon the anvil, when no-popery turned them out. A brilliant scheme, truly, and well worthy of such heads! They had consulted the "protestant gentlemen" upon it, who had, doubtless, perceived what the wise ministers had overlooked. And this is a "*concession*" to Ireland! This is "a great step towards *emancipation*." This is to be a beginning of that good, which is to conciliate the people of Ireland, and to eradicate the French faction, which Mr. Grattan told us was existing there, and to keep down which faction he himself had, it is said, *drawn up, with his own hand, the very bill, which afterwards passed into a law*, and to which bill, he, to the astonishment of all those who were not acquainted with the fact, gave his unqualified support.—No; it is not a sharper-like trick that will produce harmony in Ireland, and a general disposition to defend, against the enemy, both Ireland and England. There requires something great to be done. There requires a change in the treatment of Ireland. There requires a diminution of the burdens of the people. There requires a share of the good things of the country to be given to those ministers of religion, to whom the people in general are attached. Lords Howick and Grenville were for "*drawing off the superabundant population*," while, at the very same time, they were granting large sums of money for the express purpose of making work and purchasing food for the people of Scotland, in order to prevent them from emigrating. What wild work was this! What a total want of all fixed principle in governing was

here displayed! Just as if to be a ruler of millions of men, no capacity of thinking were required, all the talents necessary, being that of making long, dull, lawyer-like harangues.—In another part of this Register, there are two letters from a correspondent, under the name of MENTOR. These letters I beg leave to recommend to the serious perusal of the reader; and, I am much deceived, that, if they could be read by every man in England, they would not produce a very sensible effect. The importance of Ireland to England is here shown in a most clear and striking light; and, I think, it would be madness to suppose that England could long resist the conqueror, supposing him to make a landing in Ireland, with any considerable number of troops, finding the people to be what they were described to be by Mr. Grattan. When great alterations and concessions are proposed, people seem alarmed; but, if great alterations of some sort are necessary to produce that disposition in the people of Ireland which is essential to the safety of the kingdom, why should we flinch? Why should we not make them at once? We are not now in a state that allows us time to wait for a more favourable opportunity. We have not an hour to lose; for, it is impossible so to guard the sea, at all times, as to prevent a French force from sailing to Ireland; and, when it is once safely arrived there, the consequences are too evident to need detailing.—But, it is no pitiful trick, such as the one proposed, that will answer any good purpose. It would be seen through before the bill were well got into the House; yet, while it would produce no good effect with respect to Ireland, it would produce a most mischievous effect with respect to England, where the agricultural politicians have long been at work to accomplish an abolition of tythes. The example of Ireland would give them new life, and Lord Carrington's schemes would become the fashion of the day. There are many men, who would, perhaps, see the fall of the church establishment, or, at least, of the means of the maintenance of its ministers, with pleasure; and, I must confess, that the extent to which non-residence is carried, together with the manner in which benefices are conferred, are enough to disgust any man. But, there is one short observation, which I would beg leave to address to those, who, not being aristocratically inclined, would wish to see the fall of the church, and that is this: by destroying the Church establishment, you destroy about twelve thousand small proprietors of land, and transfer their property to the great proprietors already existing.—Such also, as far as it

would go in diminishing the revenues of the clergy, would be the effect of the commutation proposed by the "*patriotic protestant gentlemen*" in Ireland.

Louis XVIII.—Before I proceed to remark upon the circumstances, connected with the arrival of this prince, let me say a word or two in justification of what was contained in the last Register, by way of animadversion upon the conduct of the Morning Chronicle, whom I charged with having blamed the ministers for not having acknowledged him as king of France. There is, indeed, a good deal of verbosity, in the article, to which I alluded; but I found the following passage, which the Morning Chronicle had quoted for the truth and justice of its remarks; which it had inserted, as expressing its own sentiments; and which, if it does not, in so many words, blame the ministers for not acknowledging Louis XVIII, as king of France, certainly leaves such blame to be inferred.—“We wish ministers had sent down some distinguished nobleman to have received *his Majesty*, and that the *honours due to royalty* had been paid him upon his arrival. There is something in the manner in which we have behaved to the illustrious family of the Bourbons, not quite satisfactory to our feelings. We have afforded them an asylum and an establishment, but we seem to have done it in too measured a manner; we seem always to have acted as if we would avoid giving offence to the *usurper* of their throne. Our protection of them has had a degree of prudence, and our generosity a principle of caution in it which ill accords with the noble frankness of the British character. We would have had the members of the family received at court; we would have the fallen Majesty of Louis XVIII, cheered and consoled by the gracious regards of our good and patriot king. What! are we to pay honours and homage to royalty only when it is possessed of power? Are we to let a people see that the moment they *rebel* against a *lawful sovereign*, and suffer an upstart to *usurp his throne*, England is ready to *withdraw from that sovereign* all homage and consideration, and deference, and bestow them upon the usurper?—It is now 451 years since we had a *King of France* in this country, John, who was taken prisoner at the battle of Poitiers, by Edward the Black Prince.”—Now, is there not blame bestowed here upon the ministers? Are they not blamed for having been too measured in their conduct, with respect

to the prince? Are they not blamed for not having done *enough*; and, what more were we to conclude was meant by this writer? What more, unless to acknowledge him king of France? Nay, does not the Morning Chronicle say, that a distinguished nobleman ought to have been sent to the coast to receive “*His Majesty*,” and that the “*honours due to Royalty*” should have been paid upon his arrival? What is this short of the acknowledgement, which the Morning Chronicle is now so anxious to deny having recommended? For, if that acknowledgement was not to be understood, why is the attribute of *Majesty* conferred? And, what a mockery would it have been to pay the “*honours due to Royalty*?” Why, too, is Napoleon, in this same article, called an “*usurper*,” and the people of France “*rebels*?” Why this? How inconsistent, foolish, not to say base, are this language and these sentiments in the mouth of a person, who is not for the acknowledging of Louis XVIII as “*king of France*.” And, was I to blame, then, for saying that this writer blamed the ministers for not making that acknowledgement? He blamed them for not sending a nobleman of distinction to receive “*his Majesty*”; he blamed them for not paying, upon this occasion, the “*honours due to Royalty*”; and yet he is shame-faced, when we infer from this, that he would have had them to acknowledge the prince as *king* of France. He would have had them to *receive* Louis as king, but not to *acknowledge* him as king: amusing distinction enough; but it was, I confess, much too nice for me readily to comprehend.—Let us now revert a little to what has been said and done in other quarters.—The Morning Post, which has now become rather the satirist of Louis XVIII, began very warmly in his favour. “When,” said he, “the magnanimous emperor of the North was induced to thrust forth the houseless stranger upon the wide world, Britain, with the generous hospitality of a great and loyal nation, *held forth her arms to receive him*. Here at least he may rest assured of finding a safe and splendid retreat, undisturbed by the access of external force, or the apprehension of internal treason. *Kensington Palace*, report says, is to be appropriated to the *reception of the royal guest* and his illustrious relatives.”—The very next day, however, the writer having discovered, that it had been resolved to send the French prince to *Scotland*, happily discovered, at the same time, some most excellent reasons for not letting him have Kensington, or any

other palace, in England. Observe, that it was the very next day. He had the advantage of only one night's sleep upon it. Pray let us hear him: "the public will readily perceive, that every thing which hospitality, loyalty, and prudence could suggest or render expedient, has been done on our part to afford to the Royal Stranger that reception which alone it could in reason be supposed his *Highness*," (*Majesty* is dropped, observe,) "had been led to expect. *Holyrood House* is a royal palace, with all the *privileges* appertaining to a court annexed to it; and *when it is considered*, that owing to the numerous residences which are necessary for the accommodation of our own royal family, the duchess of Brunswick, his Majesty's sister, is in a manner, obliged to live in lodgings, a Prince of the House of Bourbon cannot pretend that due respect is not paid to him, in the friendly tender of a spacious royal palace in Scotland."

—Aye, sure! What, come to turn our own family out of their houses! What a shame! An Englishman's house is his *castle*, as we all daily experience; and, if this applies to each individual of us, in common life, how sacred ought to be the houses of the family? As for voluntarily giving up their houses, and that, too, to an utter stranger, and a foreigner, no man, in his senses, would expect it. Who is there, I ask, that does such things? Do any of us give up our houses for strangers to live in? Do we give them up even to our blood kindred? No: why, then, are we to suppose, that any of the royal dukes, for instance, would be disposed to do it? Let any one set out upon his travels, and, except he happen to get amongst some of the old-fashioned settlers in America, he may travel to the world's end without finding any one to give him bed or board for nothing. Nay, is there a scrubby public-house, wherein to sleep is impossible and to lie down is worse than to sit up, the landlord, or, rather, the keeper, of which will not make you pay even for a sight of his fire. And, are there, nevertheless, persons, who would expect our royal family to turn out of their dwellings to make room for Louis XVIII. a man to whom they are not at all related, and who, as far as I am able to conjecture, is not likely to be in a condition to repay them, either in money or in kind?

—But, though I heartily agree with the *Morning Post* in scouting the idea of any of our family giving up their houses to a stranger, I must ask him, how he came; only the day before, to tell us, that *Kensington*

Palace was destined to receive that stranger? "He was *misinformed*." Very true; but, he did not speak of the thing as absurd or incredible. He saw no impropriety in it; and related the fact with great apparent satisfaction. It was not until the next day, that he discovered the want of room in our English palaces, owing to the populousness of our own royal family. Now, for my part, the moment I heard of the thing, I said, that I was certain there would be no room for him in any of those palaces. I laughed at the idea, and I cannot help thinking, that I was heartily joined by the persons who would have been most interested in such an arrangement. "The *uncertainty of human affairs*," says this writer, "by exposing every individual to the possibility of a reverse in the changes and chances of this mortal life, generates an impulse in the human breast, that excites a lively sympathy in the sufferings of our fellow creatures. What we should expect, or desire from others, in the hour of calamity, we are prompt to afford at the moment of their distress. This feeling is so essential to social beings, so interwoven in our nature, and so inseparable from any idea of relative existence, that the man who is devoid of it, though he may wear the human form, must be an alien in the great scheme of society."—Who would suppose, that this was the exordium to an essay, intended to convince the public, that it was perfectly right to refuse Louis XVIII an apartment in one of our English palaces? Mind, I do not say, that it was not right; but, why, then, this exordium? Why, then, these very intelligible hints? The fact is, I verily believe, that the essay was begun under the preceding day's persuasion, that the French prince was to be lodged at Kensington Palace; and, when the contrary became known to the writer, he could not, for the life of him, sacrifice an inch of writing, containing, too, reflections so philosophical, and, withal, so very new; so on he fixed it as the head to an essay, the object of which was to convince us, that Louis XVIII. was, by no means, an object of our compassion, or our sympathy.—After this, however, at the end of five days, this writer, who had treated the idea of acknowledging Louis as king of France, with great contempt, appears to be a little startled at a report of his being disposed to *abdicate* his title and its appertaining claims. "A supposition," says he, "has gone forth, that Louis XVIII has arrived in this country for the purpose of consulting our government

“ about the propriety of *abdicating* his
 “ claims to the throne of France, and ac-
 “ cepting of some *indemnification*, which
 “ the present ruler of that country may have
 “ proposed to him through the medium of
 “ the Emperor of Russia; we have no doubt
 “ that such a supposition is altogether un-
 “ founded, that it will be considered as
 “ *cruel and injurious* to the character of
 “ every member of that illustrious house;
 “ that the claims which Louis XVIIIth has
 “ *inherited from a long line of ancestors*,
 “ cannot, and will not be abdicated, and
 “ that he would *spurn the idea of accept-*
 “ *ing any indemnification from the usurper*
 “ *of his throne*, and the murderer of one
 “ of the relatives of his family. He may
 “ continue banished from his native coun-
 “ try; he may be forced to become a wan-
 “ derer upon the face of the earth: he may
 “ be in misery and penury for the remain-
 “ der of his life, but there is one treasure,
 “ of which neither usurpers nor cold calcu-
 “ lating politicians are able to deprive him—
 “ *his honour*. Under any situation he will
 “ be able to exclaim with his illustrious an-
 “ cestor, Francis I., that “ our honour re-
 “ mains, though every thing else is lost.”
 —If Louis XVIII be a man of any turn
 for gaiety, he must be highly amused with
 the inconsistency of the blundering block-
 heads, whom his arrival has thrown into
 such anxiety.—First he is a king, and ought
 to be received with royal honours; next he
 is no king, “ his *Majesty*” is changed into
 “ his *Highness*,” and, as he never has been
 a king, we are under no obligations to ac-
 knowledge him as such, nay, it would be
 a violation of the compacts, wherein we
 have, repeatedly and solemnly, acknowledg-
 ed Napoleon. But, now, when there is a
 talk of his *abdicating*, of his giving up his
 title and his claims, as the successor of the
 former king of France; now he is a king
 again; and, it would be “ a cruel injury to
 his *character*” to suppose him so base as to
 give up that title, which title we will not
 acknowledge to be his due. Now, he ought
 “ to *spurn* at the idea of accepting any in-
 “ *demnification from the usurper of his*
 “ *throne*,” whose legitimate authority, be
 it observed, we have solemnly acknowledg-
 ed; and, he is to “ become a wanderer upon
 “ the face of the earth; to live in penury
 “ and misery for the remainder of his life,”
 rather than accept of a comfortable mainte-
 nance from the hands of Napoleon. This
 doctrine may suit *our* purposes; but, if Lou-
 is XVIII has not lost his senses with his
 crown, this doctrine will be matter of high
 diversion for him. “ *Honour!*” It is ho-

nour which is to prevent him from accept-
 ing of the means of existence; though, ob-
 serve, honour does not induce us to acknow-
 ledge him as king. Oh! that is quite ano-
 ther thing. That might be injurious to us.
 It might expose us to a prolongation of the
 miseries of war. Well, and is not the case
 similar? We do not acknowledge him, be-
 cause it might prove a source of misery to
 us; but, he is not to acknowledge Napoleon,
 though it would procure him a security
 against misery. Who does not see, that this
 shameful inconsistency arises from a mo-
 tive as shameful; that is to say, from the
 fear, that the abdication of Louis would
 tend to confirm the power of Napoleon, and
 to make him more formidable to us.—I
 commend the French king for having, if the
 fact be so, put our good people to the
 test in this way. It is like the device of the
 girl, who asked one lover, whether he would
 advise her to marry another lover. “ No,” said
 he, “ to be sure I would not.”—“ Well, then,”
 replied she, “ do marry me yourself, if you
 “ please.” Nothing could be more rea-
 sonable or fair. Louis XVIII comes, and
 says: “ I am, by right, king of France;
 “ but, as I cannot assert this right, to any
 “ effect, without your hearty concurrence,
 “ and as I have no establishment in the
 “ world at present, and may, finally, want
 “ bread, though I wear this splendid title, I
 “ intend, unless you will support me in my
 “ claims, to resign them to Napoleon, who
 “ offers me a certain settlement in conse-
 “ quence of such resignation.” And, what
 do we say: “ We cannot support you in
 “ your claims; for we have, by re-
 “ peated and solemn acts, acknowledged
 “ that you are not king of France; but,
 “ if you give up those claims (which
 “ we will not acknowledge you to have),
 “ you are the basest man upon the face of
 “ the earth.” In one short sentence, this
 is our language. “ To acknowledge you as
 “ king of France would be injurious to us,
 “ and, therefore, you may call yourself
 “ what you will; yet, as it is convenient
 “ to us, that Napoleon should have a rival
 “ living, we would rather that you should
 “ live in misery, with the title of king of
 “ France, than obtain a comfortable
 “ settlement by the resigning of that
 “ title.”—This is the language of the
 hearts of those, who have been concerned
 in this transaction; and, we may be assur-
 ed, that Louis XVIII is well acquainted
 with the fact, and will be at no loss what to
 do.—I think, for my part, that the ra-
 tional thing would be to accept of a settle-
 ment from Napoleon. Some men, indeed,

in the place of the Bourbons, would stake their lives against that of their rival. The family is numerous; and, somehow or other, they would, one or more at a time, find their way to the metropolis of France, to the palaces of the Emperor, or to his tents, and would cease not, until either they had destroyed him, or he had destroyed them. But, this is not their turn. They have, almost to a man, given the world convincing proofs, that they prefer safety to danger, and luxury to hardship. I remember a gallant Vandean saying to me: "Why do not some of the Bourbons stir? I have lost seven brothers in the war for royalty; and, numerous as the royal family is, not one of that family has yet ventured his life. Nothing is more easy than for any one of them to get to Paris, there to assemble twenty followers, ready to fall by his side; and with these he might sally out upon Buonaparté, at a moment when no such thing was apprehended. Suppose them to be cut to pieces. That is better than living like beggars; but, the possibility is, that they would triumph. Yet if they prefer the life they now lead, as I fear they do, I have nothing to say against it, only that they should candidly say so, and not suffer their loyal adherents to expose their lives for nothing."

—Many are the princes and royal families that we have seen assailed and overturned; and, what instances have we witnessed of bravery on their part? Have we seen one, nay only one, who has ventured his life for the preservation of his title or his dominions? Have they not all, without a single exception, run away at the approach of the French generals? And, is there a man amongst them whose desperate circumstances, have produced acts of bravery? Ah! we may revile Napoleon and his generals; we may call them by all sorts of degrading names; we may remind the world of their having been serjeants, corporals, and drum-boys, while at the same time, we bestow the epithet "*illustrious*" upon the princes who have fallen before them; but, there is a sort of natural reason in the mind of man, which renders this language of ours of no effect. This reason asks how it has happened, that so many *illustrious* persons, having all the powers, civil and military, of Europe at their command, and in their possession, should have been defeated by a set of *despicable* persons, having, when they started, no power, civil or military? "The people of the several countries were traitors to the former, and friends to the latter." But, here, again, how came it to happen,

that the people of so many countries should hate *illustrious* persons, and love *despicable* persons? "The people were seduced by the principles of the revolutionists." But, how came it to happen, that *illustrious* rulers were not able to prevent their people from being seduced by *despicable* teachers? This is the way, in which the natural reason of man, proceeds in examining all the alledged causes of the triumphs of the French; and, say what we will, the general impression, at last, is, that those triumphs are due to superior wisdom and superior valour. It is evident that the fall of the princes of the continent might have been prevented by their cordially uniting together against France; and, for their not doing so, we are, by such writers as Mr. Gentz, referred to divers petty jealousies and intrigues. But, after all, we are compelled to deduce those jealousies and intrigues from the grand cause, a want of wisdom joined in most cases to a want of valour. We may continue, therefore, to call the conquerors despicable persons, and the conquered illustrious persons; but, it will avail us nothing, either at present or in the future; and, I am convinced, that those who are the most forward in holding this language now, would, in case of a reversed state of things here, be the most forward in holding an opposite language.—The devil certainly has a grudge against the "Learned Languages," and has availed himself of this opportunity of indulging it. Louis XVIII. is, it seems, amongst other things, an excellent "*classical*" scholar. "On his arrival," says the Morning Chronicle, "at Gottenburgh, the magistracy of that town waited on him, and read him an interesting address in Latin, which had been previously prepared. The Count de Lille, who is a *profound scholar*, immediately made an appropriate and extemporaneous reply in the same language, which was remarkable for its *classical* elegance." The reader will recollect, that sometime ago, the editors of some of the London papers treated us with an intercepted letter of Buonaparté, from which it was evident, that the poor little fellow was not only not a classical scholar, but that he was deficient even in that part of the art of grammar, which the "learned" call orthography, and which the "ignorant" call *spelling*. This letter was the subject of a good deal of merriment, which lasted for several days, and would, probably, have lasted much longer, had not the attention of the learned and the witty been called off by the news of the battle of Austerlitz, which served, too, as a sort of practical il-

illustration of the inutility of Latin and Greek in the performance of great actions in the world. Every one can draw a comparison between the achievements and the present situation of Louis XVIII and Buonaparté; nor does it require the spirit of prophecy to foretell how they will stand upon the page of history. Yet, according to the notion of the "learned," Buonaparté is an ignorant fellow. I shall be told, perhaps, that the achievements of Buonaparté are not to be cited in support of my opinion respecting the inutility of what are called the "learned languages;" but, *why* not? The conqueror of Europe has been reproached for not knowing how to spell, and the person of whose throne he has got possession is now held up to our admiration as a "profound scholar;" as speaking Latin with "classical elegance." This, then, is an instance for me to cite, and a striking instance too. Here is a man, so "ignorant" (to use the epithet of the learned), that he did not, a little while ago, know how to spell; and he has not only placed himself at the head of a great nation; but, has subdued many other nations, and has made a new distribution of almost all the territory of Europe, not forgetting to cause to be issued laws, or decrees, relating to government in all its branches and departments. In short, the greatest conqueror and the greatest law-giver that Europe ever saw. And yet he hardly knows how to spell; and is, according to the notion of my correspondent, SCOT-BRITANNICUS, but one remove from a savage. But, do I pretend, that, if Buonaparté had what is called a classical education, he would have been less likely to arrive at his present greatness? Yes, I do; and, I think, it is very reasonable to suppose, that, if, from his infancy, he had had Latin and Greek sounds dinned into his head; if he had passed the flower of his youth in counting syllables upon his fingers, in writing nonsense verses, and in reading Latin and Greek books; if, in short, he had, almost necessarily, contracted the habit of regarding a knowledge of *words* as the greatest of human endowments, he never would have attained to so complete a mastery in that science, which, more than any other, perhaps, demands an extensive acquaintance with *men* and *things*.—"But, Buonaparté has men under him who are learned." Here again, the devil shows his spite against the Doctors; for, it is notorious, that the chief of his generals and ambassadors have risen from the ranks of the army; and, if I mistake not, the very general who negotiated and concluded the famous *capitulation* at the

Helder, with his Royal Highness the Duke of York (who, by-the-bye, is also a *Doctor of Laws*), was, but a few years before, a grenadier serjeant. Whether the learned Doctors of St. John's College, Oxford, admitted his Royal Highness as one of their learned body before, or after, the capitulation of the Helder, I am not certain; but, it is pretty evident, that the learning, which entitled him to the dignity, must have been acquired previous to that epoch; and, yet it did not appear, that he was, in any great degree, an over-match for the "ignorant" grenadier serjeant.—There remains one topic, not sufficiently dwelt upon in my last, namely, the granting of sums out of the taxes for the support of Louis XVIII, which grant is strongly recommended by *all* the news-writers, as far as my observation has gone. So, as a correspondent observes, because the superior genius and valour of Buonaparte and the will of the French people elevate a new dynasty in France, we are to support the wants of the exiled family; we are to oppose the effect of genius, the consequences of imbecillity, or the caprices of fortune, with resources drawn from the exertion of our industry, the labour of our nation, and the sweat of the poor. Where, again, I ask, is this to *end*? With numerous place-men and pensioners of our own, are we also to support every exiled stem of royalty and aristocracy. Who can tell what exiled monarchs and princes and nobles are yet to come? The business of exiling does not appear to be half completed; and, if we are to give support in one case, why not in another? Thus, in a few years, we may have to maintain half the former monarchs of the world. I am quite at a loss to conceive, not only how such grants (out of the earnings of the people) could be attributed to *generosity*, but how they could be reconciled to justice, or to prudence. Should peace be wanted, and peace must be made in time, how are we to get rid of the person, who, under whatever title we may support him, has claims to the throne of France? But, setting aside all consideration connected with peace, I object to the *expense*, which is already great, and which, if we be consistent, may, and probably will, become enormous. Let it be recollected, too, that the whole of the expenses, on this and similar accounts, will be ascribed to *royalty*. The consequence may easily be foreseen, and, if there be any wisdom left, it will be avoided. With what *justice* can the people of these kingdoms be called upon to support any exiled family? Is there any one from whom they have ever received any benefit?

There
If, in
XVII
with
of th
feren
be a
tional
such
But,
mon
that
the c
not a
if he
scuri
to th
ment
Po
as y
the f
coun
long
but,
chan
delay
mean
ther
awa
thin
and
men
of t
all,
grea
thin
how
for
whi
how
bee
wh
exc
lan
tak
is,
We
the
Lis
and
bee
Tr
the
we
ad
a r
Bu
ha
pl
wa
Fi

There appears to be no reason in the thing. If, indeed, it was resolved to support Louis XVIII. as king of France, and to make war with a view of placing him upon the throne of that country, the matter would be different. The grant, if made, would then be a national measure, for an avowed national purpose, and there was a time when such a measure might have been proper. But, now, there is neither justice nor common sense in it; and, one would suppose, that it would be rendered unnecessary by the choice of the prince himself, who, if not acknowledged king of France, would, if he be a wise man, prefer a perfect obscurity, in which a man may be very happy, to that splendid misery, in which a parliamentary grant would support him.

PORTUGAL.—Nothing decisive seems, as yet, to have taken place, with respect to the fate of this country. It appears unaccountable that the French should have so long delayed to take actual possession of it; but, hearing nothing except through partial channels, we must leave the reason for this delay to future developement.—In the meanwhile, we are told, that our traders there have packed up, and are ready to sail away, except, indeed, those who seem to think, that they shall make a shift to live and get money under Napoleon's government.—The breaking up of this branch of trade will not do England any harm at all, in my opinion, though it may produce great individual loss and distress; and, I think, I can safely defy any one to shew, how it can possibly diminish our resources for war, or our means of comfort in peace; while, on the contrary, I can easily shew, how those resources and those means have been diminished by this branch of trade, which produced us nothing but luxuries in exchange for the useful productions of our land and our labour.—Another view to take of this coming revolution in Portugal, is, as it affects royal governments in general. We are now told, flatly and plainly, that there are designs formed, by the people of Lisbon, upon the life of the Prince Regent; and, that, by way of defence, troops have been called in from the country places. Troops! Good heavens! are there troops, then? It is not yet a month ago, since we were assured, that the Prince Regent was adored by the people, who were ready, to a man, to follow him to the Brazils.—But, it seems, that it is *the French* who have fomented discontents amongst the people. "French emissaries!" This is always the case. But, how happens it that French emissaries became possessed of more

influence than the government? How came the people to be so much disposed to listen to French emissaries? The French no longer preach liberty and equality. They come, and they tell you they are coming, for the sole purpose of conquering, of overturning your government, and taking possession of the country. And yet, from the moment they get upon the frontiers, not a man of the country can be made to stir hand or foot against them; nay, the only hope, that seems to be entertained, is, that the people will not actually rise in arms against their own government.—There must be some *cause* for this, very different from the intrigues and instigations of French emissaries; and, it well behoves every government, which is, as yet, unassailed, to examine, by times, whether, if the hour of trial should come, it will have reason to apprehend the natural effects of such a cause.

I have received no *second* letter from Scoto Britannus; and I must defer, till my next, what I have further to say upon the subject of the *poor laws*.

Botley, Nov. 12, 1807.

ON THE DEFENCE OF IRELAND.

(Being Mentor's Second Letter.)

SIR;—I address you for the second time, again grounding my claims to your attention, on the proposition that if "Ireland is conquered by Buonapartè, England will also be conquered by him." A proposition which still appears to be incontrovertible, notwithstanding the pains which your correspondent M. H. has taken to prove the contrary. He argues from the successful resistance of the people of France, in opposing the enemies of their new system of government; I argue from the failure of all the princes of the continent, in endeavouring to rouse their subjects in defence of their old régimes; and, when I do so, I certainly have the best of the argument, and maintain my position as far as this mode of arguing bears upon the question. But, I shall not permit this most important proposition to remain explained on such shallow reasonings as that, which may be collected from the history of other nations. I shall examine what Ireland would be if she was a province of France, and what danger England would have to encounter if such an event ever came to pass. Three weeks possession of Ireland would enable Buonapartè to form an army of from one to two hundred thousand Irishmen; these he would provide with the arms taken from the yeomanry, and the militia, and out of the several depots. The private soldiers of the Irish militia, who would join his standard,

and those of his own troops would afford a sufficient number of drill serjeants; whilst the French subaltern officers, and serjeants, would be perfectly competent to supply the place of officers to this immense army. To any one in the least degree conversant with the numbers of the Irish people; with the great proportion which the poor bear to the rich; with their inclination to join the French if successful in conquering the country; and with their natural love of fighting, this statement will appear to be a most faithful one. With such an army once established, liable as England will be to be herself momentarily invaded, any attempt to reconquer Ireland must be wholly out of the question; and Buonaparté therefore, will have full opportunity to arrange his military preparations in Ireland for an invasion of England.—From Ireland an attempt of invasion must be more formidable than from any other quarter of Europe; because, the British navy cannot keep at sea in the Irish channel. From Milford Haven to Liverpool, there is no harbour in which any thing larger than a frigate can enter; to the northward of Liverpool there is no harbour even for a frigate. If a gale of wind comes on in the Channel, the custom is for every vessel to make the nearest port in order to avoid shipwreck; and, therefore, if Buonaparté was in possession of Ireland, and wished to send his troops to any part of the Welch or English coast, it would be necessary for him only to wait for the termination of a gale of wind, to be sure of having the channel to himself. Let us then suppose the whole population of Ireland at his command, and formed by his officers into large armies; let us suppose his French troops, and those of his allies, ready to embark from all the ports of Denmark, Holland, France, Spain and Italy, can any man be vain enough to flatter himself, that the people of England would be able to save their country from conquest? Can we look with confidence to such a result in the talents of the commander-in-chief? Or in those of the numerous generals whom he has selected to lead our gallant forces? Or in the counsels of our ministers, or in the zeal and patriotism of our people? The people of England once certainly lived under a constitution of government, which they would have defended against all foreign invaders; but, can it be supposed that the present race would be fired with the same zeal, which stimulated their forefathers in their virtuous exertions to defend it; now, that it exists, more as a shadow of what it once was, than as a possession of transcen-

dant value and importance? On the whole, Sir, may I not then safely conclude, that if Ireland is conquered by Buonaparté, England must also be conquered by him? It seems as if he was waiting to put his threat of invasion into execution, until he shall have completely invested England by a successful invasion of Ireland. He already covers the North East coast with Denmark, Holland, and the northern parts of France; and he covers the southern coast with Normandy and Brittany, and had he but possession of Ireland the investment would be complete. Seeing then of what advantage Ireland would be to him, to enable him to carry into effect his favourite project of invading England, can any man doubt of his whole mind being devoted to the arrangement of measures for securing the conquest of Ireland? And having such a certainty before us of what his interests are, and of what the most constant occupation of his mind must be, is it not downright madness to withhold from the people of Ireland any boon which may secure their attachment to the connection with this country? If, Sir, I was to write for ever, or, if the House of Commons were to debate night after night on the state of Ireland, the truth is, that every thing that can be said about Ireland may be resolved into this short statement: Buonaparté must have Ireland in order, to make sure of success, whenever he invades England; whilst England must secure the possession of Ireland in order to be safe from conquest. The way Buonaparté has to obtain Ireland is by the aid of fleets and armies; the way that England has to secure it, is by acting with honesty and justice towards the people of Ireland. The question then for the people of England to decide upon is this, whether or not they will secure their own safety by permitting their conduct towards Ireland to be governed by principles of honesty and justice. If they are honourable and just towards Ireland, they may depend upon it, that they will have nothing to fear from Buonaparté; but, if they are not, they had better begin to count the months and days for which they will be able to boast of their freedom and independence. For, rely upon it, that the period is not very distant, when a trial will be given to the security of England's possession of Ireland; and when it will be proved whether the act of Union, the Irish army, and the hearts of the people of Ireland, are all or any of them such bulwarks as they are commonly considered to be. I must make the continuation of this discussion, the subject of another letter.—MENTOR.

Sir
ed the
of a
" if
" Eng
I reser
the da
posed
land.
that it
respec
lity of
Buona
is a co
count
than
are no
of Ma
false c
tion o
dulge
land,
neces
fully
will t
dendi
Engin
and
statut
25 mi
and w
form
of Ir
and d
don;
lying
be ne
You
rect r
land
the I
you t
to Ca
distan
will g
tween
in th
lation
Chal
lions
grea
intel
prese
ing t
salub
cility
tains
Sir,
bein

ON THE DEFENCE OF IRELAND.

(Being Mentor's Third Letter.)

SIR;—In my last letter, I in part proved the proposition, by explaining the effects of a successful invasion of Ireland, that “if Ireland is conquered by Buonaparté, “England will also be conquered by him.” I reserved for this letter the explanation of the dangers to which England would be exposed in consequence of the capture of Ireland. But, before I proceed upon it, I feel that it is necessary to state a few more facts respecting Ireland, in order that the capability of that country to promote the views of Buonaparté may be clearly understood. It is a common error among the people of this country to think, that Ireland is not larger than Yorkshire; and that the people of it are not more numerous than the inhabitants of Manchester or Birmingham; and under this false conception of the extent and population of Ireland, a notion is too generally indulged in, that let what will happen in Ireland, an English army is all that can ever be necessary to put down rebellion, or successfully to resist invasion. Now, Sir, if you will take the trouble of looking into the appendix to Mr. Young's Tour in Ireland, the English edition, you will find that England and Wales contain 42 millions of acres, statute measure, and that Ireland contains 25 millions of acres of the same measure, and with this information you will be able to form a tolerably accurate idea of the extent of Ireland, if you take a map of England, and draw a line through Holyhead and London; for the portion of England and Wales lying to the southward of such a line, will be nearly equal in extent to that of Ireland. You will also be assisted in acquiring a correct notion of the length and breadth of Ireland if you will measure the distance from the Land's-end to York, which will give you the distance from the Giants' Causeway to Cape Clear; and if you will measure the distance from Yarmouth to Liverpool, which will give you the breadth of Ireland, between the Hill of Howth and Slinge Head, in the county of Galway. As to the population of Ireland, it is computed, by Mr. Chalmers, to have been greater than 4 millions in 1788, and by Mr. Newenham to be greater than 5 millions in 1803. Many very intelligent persons consider it to be, at the present time, beyond 6 millions, grounding their opinions upon the cheapness and salubrity of potatoe diet, and the great facility with which every man in Ireland obtains a lease of a few acres of land. Now, Sir, the population of England and Wales being little more than 9 millions, it will ap-

pear then that Ireland is not only larger than one half of England and Wales, but has a population exceeding, in number, one half of the population of England and Wales. Conceive, then, a country of so large an extent, and so populous, and the people of it so much attached to France, and distant only a few miles from our shores, once under the rule of Buonaparté; and contemplate the consequences!!! This is the true way of considering what Ireland now is; what Ireland would be if justly treated by England; and what Ireland will be if once possessed by France: A country in extent, population, trade and revenue, far beyond several independant kingdoms and principalities of Europe; not incapable of being herself an independent nation from a want of any attribute that an independent nation ought to possess; but, preferring a state of dependance on England, with a view to secure her protection, and to obtain the benefits of her constitution: A country ready to go all lengths in supporting the struggles in which England is involved; but feeling that England has no claim upon the exertions of her sons, in consequence of the policy with which for centuries, but, more particularly, during the last 6 months, she has acted towards them: A country anxious only to have an opportunity of feeling sentiments of gratitude for favours, which ought to be conferred, and to afford all the advantages of her population in warding off the imminent dangers which now threaten England; but alive to injury and insult, and not averse to a connection with France, if her connection with England should prove merely a nominal and barren boon.—If this country was but a few weeks under the government of Buonaparté's marshalls, depend upon it, Sir, the fate of England would be decided. England would have at once to be prepared against invasions from the coast of Denmark, Holland, France, Portugal, Spain, and Ireland. The numbers of troops that might be collected in either country would be so great, that it would be impracticable for the fleets and armies of England to prevent them from making good a landing; and even a landing of a small portion of troops would go a great way in securing conquest, notwithstanding the numbers and valour of the volunteers, and the inestimable blessings of the modern British constitution in church and state; for, what would become of the trade of England without a circulating medium, and of the revenue of England without trade? And what would England be if her revenue failed, but a bankrupt ruined and conquered. But if

these events were not immediately to follow an invasion, what hopes can be entertained that the contest would terminate in favour of England? The points of the coast which would be exposed to attack would be so numerous, and the opportunities of attacking so frequent, that the army and spirit of England must in the end be worn out and overcome. Peace with France would be the only resource, and that upon Buonaparté's own terms. It would be made, and when time would have afforded an opportunity for reflection, it would then be deplored, that the value of Ireland had not been better understood, and the dictates of justice and sound policy listened to in time.—It is really lamentable to reflect upon that blind policy which leaves Ireland exposed to conquest, when the operation by which she could be secured, and England placed in a state to defy France, is so simple and obvious. What do we want but the hearts of the people of Ireland to be with us, or on what can Buonaparté build his hopes of conquest, but upon our own folly in alienating them?—But, Sir, the peculiar danger to which this country would be exposed in consequence of Ireland being conquered, does not consist in the additions which Buonaparté would be able to make to his armies, but in the opportunity which he would acquire of sending his armies through Ireland into England and Wales. That he would be able to send his troops to Ireland in defiance of the fleets of England, is proved by the numerous instances which have occurred of late years, of his ships having been able to go to the West Indies, to Egypt, and to Ireland without molestation. That he would be able to transport his troops with safety from Ireland to England is evident, from the short distance between the respective coasts, and from the known fact, that no ships can keep at sea in St. George's Channel in tempestuous weather; much less men of war and frigates, for which there is no port between Milford Haven and Scotland. The passage from Dublin to Holyhead has been frequently made in row boats. The fishing boats on the eastern coast of Ireland are alone sufficient in number to convey a very large body troops; but if these were not sufficient for his purpose, the fishing boats and small craft on the west, and some shore boats might easily be collected in the several harbours between Cork and Waterford, and would afford the means of transporting an immense army. Yet, notwithstanding all this, are we doing every thing that lies in our power to promote Buonaparté's views in obtaining possession of Ireland. Bigoted and infatu-

ated nation, to see more dangers in the crucifix of an old man, called the Pope, than in the sword of Buonaparté: To be occupied in dreaming about your church being attacked by visionary armies of monks and friars; whilst your very existence as a nation is tottering before the threatened assault of your known and inveterate enemy! "Quem deus vult perdere prius dementat." But, God grant that the darkness which has obscured your intellects may yet fleet away, before more is done towards the completion of the decline and fall of the British empire! —I am, &c.—MENTOR.—Oct. 30.

SPENCE ON COMMERCE.

SIR;—The extract from Mr. Spence's pamphlet on Commerce, inserted in the last number of your Register, and there earnestly recommended to the attention of your readers, I have reflected upon with all that consideration which I am always disposed to bestow upon every work that has obtained the applause of one possessing so sound a judgment as yourself. It is impossible for me, however, to acquiesce in the proposition which it is the object of that extract to substantiate; that "all the wealth of a nation is created by agriculture, none by manufactures;" and, I shall, therefore, take the liberty of offering a few observations upon the subject. In order to be as brief as possible, I proceed at once to the example which Mr. Spence has adduced in the way of demonstration. "If a coachmaker were to employ so many men for half a year in the building of a coach, as that for their subsistence during that time he had advanced 50 quarters of corn; and if we suppose he sold this coach to a land proprietor for 60 quarters of corn, it is evident, that the coachmaker would be ten quarters of corn richer, than if he had sold it for 50 quarters, its original cost. But it is equally clear, that the land proprietor would be ten quarters of corn poorer than if he had bought his coach at its prime cost." That a land proprietor who purchases for 60 quarters of corn a coach, the prime cost of which was 50 quarters only, would after such purchase be ten quarters of corn poorer, than if he had bought it at the prime cost; and that the coachmaker would be ten quarters of corn richer, than if he had sold the coach at such original cost, are propositions too grossly plain and self-evident, to be in any danger of being controverted! But, it is not quite so apparent, that they afford the slightest countenance to the doctrine, that "manufactures are no source at all of national wealth." The deduction however,

[761]

which Mr. Spence draws from them is, that "a transfer, not a creation of wealth, has taken place; whatever one gains, the other loses, and the national wealth is just the same." Now, most certainly no creation of wealth hath arisen from the mere exchange or act of bartering the corn for the coach; for the best of all possible reasons, that the coach as well as the corn formed a part of that wealth, previously to any such exchange or transfer having taken place. Most certainly also, the coachmaker would gain the corn and lose the coach; whilst, on the other hand, the land proprietor would gain the coach and lose the corn by such a barter! But the misfortune is, that this deduction of Mr. Spence's does not, as it seems to me, comprehend the only point at issue, the only true question being whether BY THE MANUFACTURE of such a coach, no greater addition was made to the stock of wealth, than if it had not been manufactured at all? Mr. Spence's supposition seems to be, that inasmuch as the coachmaker receives for that coach an equal value in corn, by which he reimburses himself for the food advanced to the journeymen manufacturers and consumed by himself and family, during the period that the coach was building; therefore, it would be a mere transmutation of food, a wealth of a perishable nature, into a manufacture which constitutes a wealth more durable. And, that in consequence, "no wealth could with truth be said to have been brought into existence by the manufacturer." But, how happened it that Mr. Spence overlooked the consideration, that the master and journeymen manufacturers, if they had not been employed in building the coach, must notwithstanding have eaten, and would, in point of fact, have consumed the same quantity of food? Had not the coachmaker by the industry of himself and servants, erected the coach for the land proprietor, one of these two events would have taken place—either the land proprietor's 60 quarters of corn would have passed into the bellies of those persons without his receiving any equivalent in return, or otherwise would have remained in his granaries to perish. But, the coach having been built, the land proprietor finds at the end of the year, that he has not only the land to produce him a crop in the succeeding year, but that his wealth is increased by the addition of the coach. Why, then, is it not most plain that the coach which constitutes that additional wealth, was BROUGHT INTO EXISTENCE by the manufacturer?—It will be in vain to say, that if those artificers had not been so employed the land proprietor would, instead of the coach, have an ad-

dition to his wealth in the 60 quarters of corn, because, however plausible such an argument as between two individuals may to some persons appear, it will, I think, be seen from what I shall presently submit, that upon the more enlarged scale of the dealings of a nation, such an argument will not be thought by any person to hold good. Let me assume (for argument's sake) the population of a country to comprise one hundred thousand persons, consisting in part of persons employed in agriculture, and in part of persons not so employed. Either the produce of the land would be more than sufficient to supply with food the whole of such population; or, would fall short of yielding an adequate supply; or, the produce of the land and the consumption of that population would be nearly equal. In the case first supposed—if there were a yearly superabundance—it is manifest, that it had better be exported in exchange for specie, or some foreign articles of use or convenience, than that it should remain in the country to perish; and it is equally manifest, that by such an accession of specie or foreign articles, the wealth of the country would be increased.—In the second case supposed—if there should be a yearly deficiency in the supply of corn at home—then it would obviously be good policy to promote as much as possible the fabrication of manufactures, and the importation of grain, or of specie wherewith to buy grain of other nations, in exchange for such manufactures. In the third case supposed, that is, taking the produce of the land to be just sufficient for the consumption of the people, without any deficiency or redundancy—then, inasmuch as there would be a considerable portion of the community not occupied in agricultural concerns, but who nevertheless, must subsist upon the produce of the land, it can surely require no arguments to prove, that it is more fitting that they should be employed in the manufacture of useful articles, than live like so many idle drones. And to me it does seem obvious, that by such their manufactures they make an addition to the stock of individual, and consequently of national wealth, seeing that but for such manufactures the yearly produce of the land would be totally consumed, without any thing of wealth remaining to represent that yearly produce. But, in truth, there always would be manufactured by the class of artificers, a much greater number of articles than would be necessary to procure for themselves subsistence; by exchanging with the land proprietor for corn: who, then, will be bold enough to contend, that the manufacture of such supernumerary articles, and the

sale of them to foreign nations for gold (which gold, Mr. Spence assures us, is undoubtedly WEALTH), or in exchange for necessities, as tallow and barilla, for example, wherewith to make soap,—who, I ask, will be bold enough to assert, that no addition would, by such manufacturer, be made to national wealth? Aye, will Mr. S. perhaps exclaim, but in the case of the tallow and barilla, at least,—as, when the soap comes to be sold to the land proprietor, there will be given its value in corn for it, there is only a little more complexity in the case, and it will eventually turn out to be the same thing, as far as national wealth is concerned, as if the manufactures so exported had been sold to the proprietor of land for corn in the first instance. Now, Sir, I deny that the consequences would be the same; for, let it be remembered, that we are now speaking of articles of manufacture, for which, the land proprietor being already supplied, he has not the least occasion; and he would not have the useful article of soap at all, in exchange for a part of his corn, but for the industry and enterprize of the manufacturer, who exported his manufactures in exchange for the tallow and barilla.—Then, Sir, as to the point, whether any addition would be made by such manufacture and traffic to the wealth of the nation:—and it does appear to me to be indisputable, that the national wealth would thereby be increased to the *full amount of the value of the tallow and barilla*; for the owner of those raw articles is the manufacturer, who has already obtained from the land proprietor, in exchange for certain articles sold to him, sufficient grain for the subsistence of himself and journeymen; so that, the produce of the land, in exchange for those raw materials, would be to him of no service: and such manufacturer would therefore receive from the soapmaker, for his tallow and barilla, either gold or silver, or some other kind of durable wealth; thereby adding to his own individual wealth, and, by consequence, to the wealth of that nation, of whose population he makes one.—It may be admitted, that the soapmaker will receive from the land proprietor corn in exchange for his soap, but then there will not be required, for the subsistence of the soap-maker and his servants, *so much* corn as will amount in value to the full value of the soap; for, even supposing him to make no profit by the sale of the soap, yet he must at least reimburse himself the price paid for the raw material, in order to reinstate his capital by taking in exchange for some part of his soap something very different from food.—Mr.

Spence then comes to the consideration of the subject—*Whether the employment of a circulating medium affects the creation of national wealth.* “The circulating medium of “civilised nations,” he observes, “is either “gold and silver, or paper. GOLD AND SILVER ARE UNDOUBTEDLY WEALTH, yet they “are but a small portion of what has properly “a claim to that title; and a nation which “has ABUNDANCE OF GOLD AND SILVER, is “in fact not richer than if it had NONE.”—Really, Mr. Cobbett, it would be doing your readers a great kindness to explain this (to me inexplicable) paradox! You see, Sir, the gentleman tells us, that “gold and “silver are undoubtedly WEALTH;” but, only two lines below, asserts, that “a nation which has abundance of this same “gold and silver is NOT RICHER than if it “had none!” That is to say: “a nation “which is wealthy is not richer than if it “had no wealth at all!” I would not complain of this most palpable contradiction, did it not prevent me from understanding what the meaning of Mr. Spence is, and thereby deprive me of the pleasure I should otherwise feel in grappling with his reasoning. “The nation has,” Mr. Spence says, “paid an equal value of some other wealth “for this gold and silver;” and therefore it is, I suppose, that Mr. Spence concludes, that from the presence of such gold and silver the nation is not richer. Why, yes, Mr. Spence, there is certainly something in your observation. Thus, in the case which I supposed above, the manufacturers received for the *supernumerary* articles which they exported, gold and silver; but yet, perhaps, the nation was not richer after the exchange than it was after such articles were made, and before they were exported. But pray, Mr. Spence, recollect, that your argument against manufactures and commerce goes *this length*:—that neither *by* the manufactures exported, *nor* by the specie taken in exchange for them, was *any addition made to the national wealth*!—You, Mr. Spence, tell us, that “there is no good reason why “the nation should be desirous of having “gold and silver, rather than any other “species of wealth: for (say you) the only “superiority in value which the precious “metals possess over other products of “the labour of man, is their fitness for being the instruments of circulation and “exchange.” But, Sir, give me leave to ask you, does not *that very superiority* constitute a GOOD REASON why the nation should give the *preference* to gold and silver? The land, we will suppose, owing to an unfavourable harvest, has not yielded its usual,

and the expected quantity of good grain, but, if we possess an abundance of that universal medium, gold and silver, we shall be enabled to provide against the scarcity, by purchasing and importing corn from foreign countries. Is there not then, good Mr. Spence, a *good reason* why we should give preference to gold and silver? But, according to that gentleman, the necessity of having gold or silver as instruments of circulation and exchange, no longer exists. "Experi-
" rience," he observes, "has in modern
" times, evinced that paper or the promis-
" sory notes of men of undoubted property,
" form a circulating medium fully as useful
" and much less expensive." Now, there is no doubt but that the paper of individuals answers the purpose of specie within the limited circle, where the responsibility and the probability of those individuals are known; but who, besides Mr. Spence, would rank such paper as equal in convenience to gold and silver, which is current not solely within a limited circle, nor throughout the nation at large merely, but which constitutes the *universal circulating medium* of all civilized nations?—I now take my leave of Mr. Spence's observations on Commerce; at least for the present, still retaining the same opinion which I entertained before I perused those observations; that is, that the inherent wealth of every nation consists in *the land, the trade, and the industry of the people*. Were the *system*, for which Mr. Spence is so strenuous an advocate to be adopted, the land-proprietors would be rendered complete bashaws, and the population of the country absolutely dependant upon them. Then, should we in our days, see what our ancestors of old saw—the *main body of the people were vassals to the great land-holders*, and our country again over run and devastated by hordes from the more populous nations.—Only destroy the commerce of the country, which is *the nursery for our seamen*, and you at the same time DESTROY THE NAVY OF THE COUNTRY. Then will you see the country sacked by Bonaparte and his hosts of Myrmidons! Then would the old Roast Beef song not *alone* sink into contempt; but you might with equal justice jeer at and deride the national song of Rule Britannia!!—This Mr. Spence is, I warrant him, a staunch stickler for "the Dominion of the Seas," and with most admirable consistency no doubt inveighs at the same time against commerce, although it is *to that very commerce* that we are indebted for THE MEANS OF SECURING THAT DOMINION: I too (as I believe you know Mr. Cobbett), am a zealous friend to our supporting the

DOMINION OF THE SEAS; but I should deem myself guilty of the most glaring contradiction, if I were not at the same time a friend to our manufactures and commerce, for, if I ever thought that, abstractedly considered, those manufactures and that commerce were rather prejudicial than of benefit to the country, still should I think it wise to cultivate rather than check their growth, being firmly convinced, that *our naval greatness is inseparable from our commerce*, and consequently, that *that commerce is OF VITAL IMPORTANCE to the country*.—I am, Sir, yours,—W. H. WROC. — *New Square, Lincoln's-Inn, Nov. 10th, 1807.*

SINKING FUND.

SIR;—Although your correspondent C. S. has proved to your satisfaction, that payment of the nation's debts by means of the sinking fund, must increase the taxes, *depreciate money*, raise the price current, and ruin us all, sevenfold; I venture to suggest a doubt, that C. S.'s conclusions are not quite certain. C. S. (see Pol. Reg. Vol. xii. p. 445) states as the grounds of his argument, "1st. That agriculture and manu-
" factures have found their limit, or are in-
" capable of extension. 2d. That the pre-
" sent capital in trade amounts to 100 mil-
" lions. 3d. That the funded debt amounts
" to 600 millions." These three premises granted, he concludes that, "if the said
" funded debt of 600 millions be discharged
" by means of the sinking fund, then the
" capital in trade will be *increased* to 700
" millions; the depreciation of money will
" be in the proportion of seven to one
" of its present value, and the effects
" will be, &c. &c."—Sir, for the present I only venture to doubt, because, if *one* million be *drawn out* of the circulating capital of 100 millions, that capital is thereby *reduced* to 99; and if the sinking fund applies the said *one* million in discharge of so much of the *debt* of 600 millions, then is the debt reduced to 599, and the one million *returned* into the *circulating capital* which had been reduced by means of the tax to 99. Of course, it (the circulating capital) is *restored* to its previous total of 100 millions; but, I doubt if it be thereby *increased*, or money thereby depreciated. Repeat the operation, draw *one* again *out* of the circulating capital so *restored* to its total, with that one so drawn out, pay off one more of the *debt* of 599 millions, then is the debt reduced to 598; the one million returned again to circulation, the circulating capital again complete, but *not increased*. Had I the advantages of a Scotch education, I could

explain these doubts of mine better, but a mere Irishman must be content to support them by repetition. If the debt be 600 millions: If the capital be 100: If part of that capital be taken up and applied to the payment of part of the debt, then is the debt *less*, but the capital not *more*, although the operation be repeated to infinity, or the whole debt paid. As the oceans and rivers are always flowing, why are we not fearful that *water* must at last be too abundant? Because we think that a certain quantity is destined to the uses of this world, that *all* which flows is gradually taken up at the line in vapour, and restored by the winds to its first sources, that they may continue to flow and to be supplied for ever; but one drop of increase or decrease, in the whole system is impossible. Pray, Mr. Cobbett, shew how such an operation can make the certain quantity *more*; but, if you cannot prove that, if the constant and regular depreciation of money *cannot* be the effect of such a cause as C. S. has stated, then all his terrible anticipations of the sinking fund bubble vanish; and then you will seek a better foundation for the boldest of all your speculations. —I am, &c.—OSGUR, of Leinster.

POOR LAWS.

SIR;—Having observed, in several of your late publications, several severe animadversions on the conductors of the Edinburgh Review. Although I am by no means a partisan of theirs, or do not for the most part coincide with them in political sentiment; yet, when I see them thus undeservedly attacked on the score of nationality alone; merely on account of the country which has given them birth: I feel myself impelled to step forth and expose the unworthy motive by which you would appear to be actuated. You seem thereby exceedingly inclined to rekindle that spirit of reciprocal jarring between the two countries, which have happily for a long time been totally hushed — Your own confession as to your never having been an inmate of Scotland, renders you completely disqualified from giving any just opinion as to the internal circumstances of her situation, and more especially from indulging in invidious comparisons, which are predetermined to resolve to her disadvantage. Yet even with the trifling intelligence which you possess on the subject, which has served to excite in your breast such a heated animosity toward the natives of Scotland, and that not from any fault on their part, but merely on account of a well merited compliment, intended to have been passed toward them; I can scarcely conceive you totally serious in your assertion,

that if a man be thoroughly acquainted with the various objects which constitute his more immediate avocation in life, he is not to be termed ignorant, although utterly unable either to read or to write. At least, if such are your sentiments, I will enter my ready protest against them; as I conceive the term ignorant, is very properly applied to any man even in that situation. Surely it is not your intention to argue, that man's views should be merely circumscribed to the present transitory scene; that his attention should be wholly engrossed by his worldly concerns; and that any attention to his everlasting situation should be quite disregarded. If this, then, is not the case, you must readily admit that, in order that a man may successfully obviate the appellation of ignorant, it is not merely sufficient that he hearken to a short discourse from his pastor on Sunday, but that he must likewise search the scriptures and judge for himself, as many discourses (without intending any insinuation against pastors in general) may be merely considered as the theoretic declamations of the individuals themselves, to judge of which it is necessary to search into the scriptures. We are indeed, enjoined in these sacred writings "to try the spirits whether they be of God, to search diligently into the scriptures as they contain the words of eternal life," and how is it possible that a man can do so who is unable to read? I think enough has already been stated to expose the fallacy of the foundation upon which your former speculations are founded; but should you yet obstinately persevere in the promulgation of them; all that I shall say in addition is this that they will thus serve to place your principles in their genuine light. — Yours, &c. SCOTUS.—*Edinburgh, November 7, 1807.*

DOMINION OF THE SEA.

SIR;—An absence from London has prevented me till this morning from perusing the letter of your correspondent R. R; in answer to the objections raised by Wroc and myself against the positions he laid down in a former letter, in order to shew that we had no right to the Dominion of the Sea. R. R's. conclusion to his letter, I confess, made a singular impression upon my mind; he says he never undertook a more painful task in his life, than by endeavouring to shew that we are unjustifiable in exercising the Dominion of the Sea. Now, the gentleman is certainly doubly unfortunate; first, to have been the victim of a conspiracy of wild fallacies which have produced the pain; and secondly, to labour under a most calamitous pertinacity which occasions its continuation. The observations that occurred to

me were extremely general, but the ingenious and elaborate detail of Wroc might have cured a more diseased mind, (I should have thought) than even the painful one of R. R's. As the defence of the arguments of Wroc can fall into no hands more able than his own, I shall merely consider the observations thrown out by myself which R. R. has opposed. The question of the Dominion of the Sea turned upon the point of right, or rather it was made to turn upon it, as I imagined, unnecessarily. You had insisted, Mr. Cobbett, that "force conferred right," and R. R. had advanced an opinion that "occupancy or first possession conferred it;" and I, with more boldness probably than wisdom or prudence, ventured to dissent from both doctrines, and contended that neither the one nor the other established a right. Perhaps upon this as upon many other occasions, it may remove some obstacles in the field of contest, if I were to state what appeared to me the definition of right as applicable to the argument in question. It seemed pretty well agreed that whatever the law of nations might be; whether it could subsist or not without a tribunal to enforce obedience, it certainly was dissolved from the instant that any one nation could infringe the law (as France is perpetually doing) with impunity. The right therefore in question, derives no part of its definition from any human compact or law, but is simply a natural or moral right, affecting equally all the inhabitants of the earth: It implies a rule of conduct which the Chinese, the African, and the European, are alike called upon to observe. I notice my interpretation of the word right as used in this argument, because R. R. evidently adheres to no definite meaning; he mingles indiscriminately the interpretation of right, as applicable to an arbitrary compact, with that of the law of nature as divested of all arbitrary compact; when therefore I said, that in the case of a few emigrants seizing upon some uninhabited territory which produced a subsistence for numbers exceeding themselves, such emigrants could not of right resist the claims of an half-starved traveller, either to satisfy his hunger with the surplus produce, or to adopt a part of the soil for his local habitation, your correspondent R. R. answers, that upon such principle, "Frenchmen, Germans, and every other nation, have a right to come among us and enjoy all the privileges in common with us which we possess."

Now, in this instance R. R. confuses himself by confounding the two distinct and different meanings of right which I have before noticed. With respect to *our* laws it would be wrong for Germans and other nations to insist on a communion with us of enjoyments on our own soil; but how is it with respect to the law of nature?—I know that we defend by *force* our exclusive enjoyment of the cultivated and uncultivated parts of this soil against the inroads of every foreigner, whether he come from civilized Europe or the deserts of Arabia; but, by that same law of nature, I am at a loss to discover the exclusive *right*: I am bewildered to find out the punishment that either conscience or religion denounces against the shivering Iclander who should wander from the inclemency of his own country to shelter and solace himself in our milder hemisphere. Here however, upon this very ground, R. R. brands his spear, and bids defiance: his armour indeed seems weak and unavailing. I must give his own words. He says, "the Almighty when he created the world gave to man dominion over the sea, and endowed him with *reason*; and that *reason* shews that those gifts which were intended for all mankind, belong to *him who first* has the good fortune to possess himself of them, or such a portion of them as is necessary for his use and enjoyment; and it further shews, that it is unjust to molest him in that possession or to deprive him of it." How far the *intuitive* judgment of R. R. may afford *him* the indisputable conclusion he has laid down, it is impossible for me to venture a conjecture; but that *reason* flowing from a consideration of the admitted fact, that "God gave man dominion over the sea" can attain to the same conclusion I must be permitted very much to question. Because the Deity gave man dominion over the whole habitable globe, does it follow as a consequence, that the man who precedes me in his nativity half-a-dozen years, should be stamped by Providence with the prerogative of monopolizing those means of subsistence which shall *sate* him and *leave me in squalid wretchedness*? Reason and such an argument surely pursue different ways. I can't catch even a faint glimpse of reason in the adoption of such a position. R. R. however stumbles through this rugged path, which he has too precipitately consecrated to reason, and rests himself on a support which shakes to its very base: R. R. introduces that useful companion of wavering judgments,

2 C

"OR," and intimates that if God did not intend the first occupier to possess ALL the gifts of the earth, he at least intended he should possess such a portion of them as are necessary to his use and enjoyment: but how miserably is the *first* part of the argument frittered away in the *latter*. Take this latter part alone to be true, and let the advocate for first occupancy defend my possession, if he can, to the mansion I inhabit. If my right only extends to what is *necessary* to my use and enjoyment, upon what *tenure* do I hold a capacious house, my gardens, and my pleasure grounds; are the *WHOLE* necessary to my use and enjoyment, or will R. R. tell me *what portion* I can of right preserve? I think I may leave my opponent here just to rouse himself amid the cloudy maze of right in which he has enveloped himself, and proceed to the only other objection he has taken. R. R. observes, that I have asserted (what I still contend is true) that neither occupancy nor force confer right; and he argues from thence that "as we have undeniably acquired the dominion of the sea by force," and as there occurs to him "only two ways in which that could be done, namely, rightfully and wrongfully; if it has *not* been effected rightfully" as he insists I have contended, "it must," he says, "have been effected wrongfully, and therefore that we are according to my confession *wrongfully* in the possession of the dominion of the sea; and that in fact we agree in the same conclusion." Now, R. R. is convinced, I have no doubt, that he has placed me in a strange dilemma, but he must excuse me when I inform him, that a perverted judgment has led him throughout into erroneous conclusions: that he travels from fallacy to sophism until he arrives at the acmé of misapprehension, of which I think in this instance I shall satisfy him. I asserted it is true that neither force nor occupancy conferred right; *abstractedly* I contend they do not; and I am still inclined to hold that opinion, which I believe to be correct; but I no where asserted that neither force nor occupancy accompanied with other collateral circumstances did not create a right, which it would evince the want of wisdom to abandon; on the contrary, I thought the peculiar situation of this country did justify that coercion by which we should acquire the dominion of the sea; and I insisted therefore that we were "urged by every ray of reason and policy to maintain such dominion." R. R. will pardon me if I have been plain and explicit with him; and he must not attribute the warmth of argument to intentional personality. If the former be an offence

I must plead guilty, but the latter I disclaim. Feeling, therefore I trust, as much for the honour of my country as R. R., and anxious equally with him for its preservation, I am solicitous that the dominion of the sea should be sustained upon *fair* and *honourable* grounds; that it can be so sustained, I have myself a full and clear conviction; and though our dominion of the sea may fret the sceptic sensibility of the CASUIST, it will not I think offer much violence to the feelings of an HONEST MAN; and as in the latter class I have every reason for placing our friend R. R. I entertain a hope that in a future letter, I shall find his conscience upon this subject in perfect coincidence with my own. — CANDIDUS.—*Lincoln's Inn* October 26, 1807.

DOMINION OF THE SEAS.

SIR;—Two of your correspondents entered into a discussion of, and attempted to controvert the doctrine advanced by me relative to the dominion of the seas; and, in your Register of the 18th inst. I inserted an answer to their arguments, which has had the effect to silence one, and would, I think, have produced a similar effect on the other, if he had possessed equal good sense.—It is my intention now to confine myself to the remarks of your correspondent Wroc, which appeared in your last number; and, in doing this, I will also be as brief as possible; but, before I come to the consideration of the subject of occupancy, a proper acknowledgment is due for the *kindness* which has been expressed for me. Having in my first letter stated, that occupancy or *first* possession confers right, Wroc states, that he kindly agreed to accept my real meaning to be occupancy or *present* possession. Now, in what does this kindness consist? It is imagined that I give a wrong meaning to the word occupancy, when I state it to be first possession; (on which I shall make an observation or two hereafter) your correspondent Wroc, therefore *kindly* agrees to give it a different interpretation, which has this effect: he raises a gross charge of inconsistency, and makes my own arguments demolish my doctrine of occupancy, thereby committing suicide. This is the kindness for which I am indebted, and which, I certainly feel, has laid me under vast obligations. No, Wroc! No more of your kindness; as much open, honourable, and manly contention as you please, but no more kindness, "for you are kind only to be cruel." I come now to consider the meaning of the word occupancy; and, I certainly did think at the time I wrote my first letter, that oc-

occupancy *technically* (if I may be allowed the expression) did mean first possession; although I knew that in strictness and in common parlance, it meant possession *generally*. This impression on my mind was made by a perusal of that chapter which treats on the subject in Blackstone's Commentaries, about ten years ago. But, I was not positively of that opinion, and certainly entertained some doubts respecting it. And not having it in my power, immediately to have recourse to Blackstone to satisfy myself; I therefore added "first possession;" explaining my meaning of the term occupancy to be first possession; but it is rather ludicrous, that Wroc, who in such a triumphant manner exposed the error I had fallen into, (if it be one, for I yet have not referred to the learned judge's work) should have committed one fully as absurd, and in him perfectly unjustifiable, for he defines occupancy to be *present* possession. Now, if the term has not the meaning which I attributed to it, it unquestionably can only mean possession generally. Wroc having stated, that when there are two claimants, the first possessor and present possessor, they would find themselves puzzled to determine to which of them the right belonged; by referring to my rule for a guide; to this I replied, "that there could not be any puzzle, for if a ship occupy a certain station, and is dispossessed by force by another ship, my rule being that first possession confers right, the first occupant has the right." This I thought was a satisfactory answer; and notwithstanding the sneer of your correspondent at Mr. Whitbread and myself, I still entertain the same opinion. But why introduce the name of Mr. Whitbread? What has he to do with the question? Or, if he have, why ill naturedly sneer at him for his profession? I see no reason why a brewer is not as fit a person to be a legislator as any other man. If, indeed, Mr. Whitbread drank his own porter, there might be some reason for it; for I have heard that this beverage possesses a stupifying property. But, Mr. Whitbread, you may rely on it, drinks generous and costly wines, and other liquors. With regard to the charge of having "dropped half the rule," by omitting the word occupancy, this was merely a casual omission, nor do I consider it to be of the smallest importance, for either of the expressions occupancy or first possession, (they being according to my definition synonymous) will without the other make the rule complete. I further observed, "if the first ship had left the station, and the other had taken possession of it, and the first had returned

"and claimed it, the present occupier would clearly be entitled to retain it; because, in abandoning the station, the first possessor relinquished his right to it, and it again became common." Wroc observes on this part of my answer, that when he asserted in opposition to my doctrine, that a first possessor could not transmit the right which he acquired by such possession, I did positively assert, "that it was never stated by me that the right ceased with the possession." This is perfectly correct, and there is not that inconsistency in the position which your correspondent Wroc seems to infer. Does it follow, because I stated in general terms, "that I never said that right ceases with possession;" that I meant to say that cases might not arise in which the right would so cease? This obviously could not have been the case, for I have more than once taken notice of such cases. And I have stated with regard to the principal question, that vessels acquire a temporary right to that part of the sea which they occupy, but the moment they abandon the possession the right ceases. My meaning obviously was, that it was never stated by me that the right *always* ceased with the possession. I trust that I have once more removed the rubbish which Wroc has thrown in the way of a fair investigation of the subject. The charges of inconsistency, rage, absurdity, subterfuge, and dunghill cock, which he has brought against me, are of a serious and startling nature, and might prove fatal to the cause of a person less acquainted than myself with the finesse of many gentlemen learned in the law, who conscious of the weakness of their own cause, endeavour to find defects in that of their adversaries, and not succeeding in the attempt, adopt bold assertion, though utterly unsupported by the fact, following the advice of the Scotch advocate mentioned in your last number, "hoot away mon, admit the fact for the sake of the argument." But, I take the liberty of informing your correspondent, that such conduct is utterly harmless, as it affects myself; and that I am not thus to be turned aside from my pursuit after truth. I stated in my last communication, that the sea *from its nature*, was incapable of occupancy. Wroc inquires in what this consists, and intimates that the sea is as capable of occupancy as the land. The reason that I did not state why the sea was not capable of being occupied was, that I conceived it to be sufficiently obvious. But, it is this, and the best way to explain it is, to show how the *land* is capable of occupancy. This may be done by inclosing it, sowing,

planting, or stocking it with cattle, &c. &c. But none of those methods can be adopted with regard to the sea. Land, too, let me observe, is permanent and fixed; and, therefore, when taken possession of it is capable of being retained; but this is not the case with water, which is only temporary and fugitive. The water which constitutes this or that sea, is not the water which did constitute it a twelvemonth ago, nor which will constitute it a twelvemonth hence; and, therefore, if the act were not ridiculous in itself, should Denmark, Sweden, or Russia, for instance, take possession of the Baltic sea, how could it be retained? But, let us grant for the sake of the argument, that the sea is capable of occupancy; I would ask, if any such act of occupancy has ever been committed by this country? It unquestionably never has. Every nation has always, if I may be allowed the expression, stocked in common. With regard to my observation, that a certain portion of the sea may belong exclusively to nations, as far as may be necessary for navigating their vessels, I have to remark, that the construction Wroc has put on it is nearly correct; namely, "that so much of the sea as any particular vessel covers for the time being, belongs exclusively not to the nation to which the vessel belongs, but to the owner of the vessel." If the vessel is a national one, the part of the sea which it occupies belongs for the time being to the nation which is the owner of the vessel; but, if it be a private one, the right belongs to the owner of it or to the captain. I only mentioned the above instance to shew that the sea was capable of being occupied partially, and in what manner; but, I did not mean to intimate that there are not other cases of a similar nature, as fisheries, &c.; for such there undoubtedly are.—I have been charged with subterfuge, in not noticing a case put by Wroc. My reason for not doing it was, because I considered it to be virtually demolished by the answer, which I had attempted to give to other arguments, and not from the dirty motive ascribed to me. The case is this, "suppose, that when all things were in common, two individuals, or two tribes, were equally desirous of possessing any particular unoccupied spot of territory, natural reason would not dictate that it belonged to one of them rather than to the other; and there would be no established law in such a state to be appealed to, or to which either would be bound to submit, what is to determine the point but force?" Why, occupancy. If two persons or two clans, or any other bodies of persons be desirous of

enjoying a particular spot of land, let them run a race for it, and let the person or persons who first arrive there enjoy it, for they are entitled to it by occupancy. This I stated *virtually* in my last communication; and, therefore, virtually answered this case which has brought down upon me the unmerited censure of Wroc. Besides, even granting to that gentleman all the credit which he expected from this case, as far as respects the question being determinable by force, I deny that it would establish the principle, that force confers right. It does not follow that if a case arises to which the general principle of occupancy is inapplicable, force must be had recourse to, that in those cases to which it does apply, force must likewise be used. That case would be supported and determined by its own particular circumstances. A case has just occurred to me, which though I conceive to be unnecessary, and rather out of method, I cannot forbear inserting on account of its analogy. When Mrs. Siddons, Mr. Kemble, or any other of our most excellent actors and actresses, are announced to perform some part at the theatre, in which they excel, crowds assemble at the doors before they are opened, all anxious to get commodious seats. The doors fly open, the crowd rushes in, then what ensues? They who are fortunate to take the *first possession* of the most convenient placed keep them uninterruptedly during all the time of the performance, if they think proper to do so. And this would be the case with the particular spot of land, or in justice ought to be so. I have now gone through all the arguments advanced by Wroc, which I conceive are applicable to the point in dispute, but there are some expressions contained in the latter part of his last communications which I mean to make an observation or two on. It is stated, "it shall be conceded to him" (to me) "that the sea was like the earth, originally in common, and (for arguments sake) that the sea unlike the earth did not from its nature, admit of a sovereignty being acquired in it by occupancy merely, would it follow, that this nation cannot have acquired a right to such a sovereignty by any other means, or upon any other ground? Is the writer ignorant that other nations have fought and struggled hard with us in order that they might themselves possess that very sovereignty which we have conquered. Is he indeed ignorant, that after such a contest right to the object contended for is with the conqueror." I have no quarrel with the sovereignty we possess at sea; I hope it will always remain as decisive as it is at pre-

sent, for this sovereignty is the principal bulwark of the country. No, I have no objection to the sovereignty of the sea by us, but I object to the *exercise of it* in the manner we do, on neutral nations. I do not object that "we enjoy the strength of a giant, it is glorious to do so; but, I object that we exercise it like a giant, because that is tyrannous and unjust."—R. R.

DOMINION OF THE SEAS.

SIR;—The distance of my present residence from town has prevented me from sooner expressing my obligations to Mr. W. Burdon, of No. 7, Somerset Street, Portman Square, for the information which I have derived from his most acute and profoundly learned lucubrations upon the subject of the Rights and Laws of Nations, inserted in the last Number but one of your Political Register (p. 661.) When in his opening period he observed: "the subject of the laws and rights of nations being in my opinion, much misconceived, permit me to use my endeavours to place it in its proper light," I confess, that my mind was, in some measure, prepared for the appearance of those grand and sublime conceptions with which Mr. W. Burdon, of No. 7, Somerset Street, Portman Square, has irradiated the subject. Anticipating what would be the substance of those lucubrations; "here," said I to myself, "shall we see the misconceived notions of such weak reasoners as Mr. Cobbett, who has argued against the existence of any such thing as a *law* (properly so called) of *nations* completely exposed, and the thing placed in its proper light." Nor, Sir, was I disappointed; for, the very next passage which ensued was so pregnant with sound reasoning, that it was quite impossible that it should fail of producing that effect. Pray let it adorn your pages once more: "that nations have rights as well as individuals, and *laws too*, cannot for a moment be doubted!" Now, could any thing, in the shape of argument, be more satisfactory and convincing than the passage last quoted, which you see, Sir, *takes for granted* the only thing, which, with respect to the laws of nations, stood in need of proof!! But, Sir, this is not all, for the sage follows up his logical argument with a prophetic denunciation, calculated to make you, Mr. Cobbett, and all who agree with you upon this subject, quake with terror! Steel your nerves, then, to meet the shock a second time! "To deny," he observes, "the rights and the laws of nations would be to realize that savage state of nature,

"which has hardly ever existed but in the warm region of a poetical fancy!!" Say no more, Mr. Cobbett, for Heaven's sake, against the existence of any law of nations, seeing that Mr. W. Burdon hath clearly demonstrated, "that in proportion to the success with which your arguments are attended, will the civilized nations of the earth approximate to a savage state!!" Thanks, unfeigned thanks, to Mr. W. Burdon for his exertions in the cause of nations!! Grotius, Vattel, Puffendorf, ye are outdone!!—So much for Mr. W. Burdon's reasoning in proof of the actual existence of the rights and laws of nations. Now for Mr. W. Burdon's new invented code of *maxims*, as he calls them, with respect to those Rights and those Laws. First, for the Rights, and here again the new light of Mr. W. Burdon has shone forth with so much effulgence, that all those old fashioned notions, as to the rights of nations, which I had once entertained, fled at its approach like the flimsy vapours of the night before the great orb of day.—"The rights of nations," says Mr. W. Burdon, "like those of individuals, arise from their acquisitions in society." Precious discovery!!! Whatever any particular nation does, then, in point of fact acquire, it also acquires a *right to*, no matter whether the means employed be iniquitous or just! However, Mr. W. Burdon gives a most satisfactory reason which cannot fail to reconcile us to this new doctrine of his, for he adds, that, "*such is the nature of man* that it is not always requisite to scrutinize too severely into the origin of those acquisitions, though it is at all times justifiable to resist the encroachments of power whether public or private." In saying thus much, Mr. W. Burdon, has, doubtless, given the reason why such a scrutiny, being requisite or not, depends upon *the nature of man*, although I cannot, for my life and soul, discover it. This inference, however, is sufficiently apparent—that in Mr. W. Burdon's opinion it is *sometimes* requisite to scrutinize *too severely*, and, as it will presently appear more clearly, requisite sometimes not to scrutinize at all, even in those cases where resistance to the power exerted would have been justifiable: for Mr. W. Burdon assures us: "though time may legalize the acquisitions of conquest or fraud, nothing can diminish their original injustice!!" And, Sir, Mr. W. Burdon is right, for time is to be sure a worker of wonders, and it is in that way easily to be accounted for, that what has its root in iniquity becomes sanctified; and that an act origi-

nally unjust, and the *injustice* of which (mark ye!) is *not*, in any degree, *diminished*, does, notwithstanding, become *legalized!!!* This, Sir, is, I take it, Mr. W. Burdon's mode of placing before us the equity of the thing, "in its proper light." Unfortunately for yourself, Mr. Cobbett, as well as your readers, this Mr. W. Burdon, of No. 7, Somerset Street, Portman Square, does not define the laws of nations, but in a most patriotic manner asserts, that we have departed from the general principles of those laws "in asserting the Dominion of the Seas and violating the rights of neutral nations," but yet trusts (kind gentleman!) that those "maxims," (maxims!!) which he has stated, and upon which I have commented above, will justify us. How grateful, Sir, ought not the country at large to be to the author of such a justification! But, whatever the tenor of the laws of nations may be, those laws are not, it seems, "capable of being considered in any other light than a compact among a few individuals which cease to be binding upon the rest when they are so far violated by one as to affect their common or individual safety." He had told us before, that "the laws of nations are for ever liable to the unjust control of any individual." In that period of darkness which preceded the luminous appearance in print of Mr. W. Burdon, I erroneously supposed, that nothing could, with any propriety, be called a law which did not come within the definition of *a rule of action prescribed by some superior to an inferior power, which rule such inferior was bound, and might by the superior, be compelled to obey.* But, now, after Mr. W. Burdon's learned exposition, my sentiments have, of course, been revolutionized, and I have found it impossible not to imbibe an opinion, that the stipulations entered into is a mere league between nations—a league "existing in practical convenience only," which admits of being totally dissolved at the will of any particular nation inclined to violate those stipulations—a violation, too, which does not draw down upon the aggressor the vengeance or resentment of the other nations lately in league with it.—I say, Mr. Cobbett, that it would be a most unpardonable perverseness not to agree with Mr. W. Burdon, of No. 7, Somerset Street, Portman Square, that such stipulations are, with strict propriety, denominated by him, *LAWS.*—Have a care, Mr. Cobbett, how you enter the lists with this champion, for as it is impossible to make any impression upon a shadow, however keen may be the edge of your weapon, so

will you find his reasoning to be invulnerable. Yours &c. —GEORGE DAVEY.—
Allstock Cottage, near Charmouth.

DOMINION OF THE SEAS.

SIR;—Since late, we, your readers, have been entertained with your dissertations respecting the dominion of the seas; but, I for one, doubt much whether you and your correspondents who have favoured us with their productions upon this head, are quite correct respecting our right to that dominion having *at all times*, or even *ever* been *universally* admitted.—I shall not now discuss that point, but wish to call your attention to the *use* which we have made, and now make, of the power we hold, and by which we have so much exasperated all the continental seafaring nations. I am inclined to believe, Mr. Cobbett, that neither you, nor seven-eighths of the nation; no, nor even the judge of the Honourable Court of Admiralty himself, is aware of the abuse of our maritime power, and of the injustice that is committed, not by the brave tars who so gallantly fight the battles of the nation, but by a few (perhaps a dozen) cowardly privateers, fitted out by some unprincipled owners, who by detaining every neutral vessel, however little reason there may be for suspicion, cause great depredation upon the neutral trade and property, and bring disgrace, hatred, and vengeance down upon the unoffending, and not participating nation.—Far be it from me to reflect upon the decisions of the learned judge of that most honourable court. I merely allude to the practices out of court. I wish the country at large to be made acquainted with them, and it will be found that those privateers have contrived matters so ingeniously, that it becomes nearly a matter of indifference to them, whether the judge restores or condemns the property in question, and strange as it may appear, it is frequently the case, that the former is more profitable to them than the latter, because they almost always have their expences decreed to them. Suppose that a vessel and cargo is by them detained, the vessel is generally immediately released, but the cargo it is pretended must be brought before the court, which from the long list of cases pending in that court, is not likely to get a hearing in less than 18 months, or two years, and affords them an opportunity of unloading and warehousing the cargo.—The next step is to inveigle some brokers by the expectation of a commission, or otherwise, to declare that the goods are in a perishable state, and that *in their opinion*, it would be for the interest of those concerned, if an im-

mediate sale were made, and by means of this broker's certificate, a commission of appraisement and sale is obtained. Then the captor's agents proceed with alacrity to sell, and as no attention is paid to the circumstance of the goods being at an out of the way port, instead of being at the proper market for which they were intended and prepared, it will be evident that they do not frequently sell for one-fourth of their cost; and never otherwise than at a great loss instead of a profit, to which every trader naturally looks. The miserable proceeds are then, after remaining some time in the hands of the captor's agent brought into court, and upon restitution being decreed, the neutral claimant may receive them upon a further payment of poundage to the registrar; and fortunate is the neutral trader, if after payment of the heavy law expences, any proceeds remain to be remitted abroad. —I have now, Mr. Cobbett, explained how the neutral trader loses, but you would not comprehend how the captors make their profits, if I were not to add, that besides being owners of privateers, they are lightermen, wharfingers, warehouse-keepers, brokers, agents, &c. &c. And you will now be enabled to guess that the goods on being landed, housed, and sold pay, and are wasted so unmercifully, that the captors on having their expences paid, are no great losers.—The board of trade many months ago made some investigation into these nefarious practices, and, I doubt not, that as redress is long a coming, it will be the more effectual. If you should deem this subject worth an introduction into the Register, it will lead to the exposure of many more iniquitous practices attending the privateering system; and I remain, Sir, &c.—R.

EXPATRIATION.

SIR;—I am somewhat at a loss to refer to that part of my letter to you, in which it seems, from your observation (p. 646), I have relinquished my "former construction of the *Law of England*."—There is one passage in my 2d. letter (the last sentence p. 609) which possibly may have induced your animadversion: if this be so, it is necessary that I undeceive you, and more clearly explain myself. In that passage, I referred merely to the weakness of Candidus's remark resting on no better authority than "his mere assertion," and to shew the slender thread on which that observation hung, I meant to convey, which perhaps my expression did not sufficiently do, that my assertion was equally good, and carried as much weight, though I should adopt a contrary

system, not thereby meaning to convey the idea, that "capacity" of expatriation was not laid down, but that if I chose to assert this, without better authority than an *ipse dixit*, my remark, opposed to his, was of equal weight. This, and no more, did I intend; and I trust I shall be acquitted of sophistry in this explanation, especially when it is recollected, that my following remarks (612) in support of my construction of the *Law of England*, contain further authorities, viz. Bracton, Fleta, and Stamford, which, although you object to Vattel on the law of nations, and Wicquefort's book on Ambassadors, I presume you cannot dissent from. They convey to us what was the common law, and with respect to my ideas upon the statute law they remain as they were. I certainly do, Mr. Cobbett, insist upon my former construction of the *Law of England*, and as to the doctrines of Vattel and Wicquefort as my ideas perfectly coincide with them, I deemed it more proper to refer to them than adopt their opinions as part of my argument. Candidus's charge of adopting, "revolutionary principles," would have been well founded, if I had in conformity to the doctrine of the French Emperor overturned Vattel's exposition of the *Law of Nations*, which has been long acted upon, and I do not see why I should attempt to dispute Vattel's authority, because it may suit his purpose to dispute it, or the propriety of that which Vattel lays down to be the *Law of Nations*. Vattel does not give us a mere dictum, but he furnishes us with what I deem to be solid argument. Your argument—but which however you have not favoured me with, opposing his. I should wish to have considered; the only reason I did not furnish you with Vattel's arguments, was an apprehension of occupying a greater space in your Register than strictly allowable, and in consequence I referred you to the passages on which I relied. I rest under a serious charge of sophistry, and am stigmatized with the adoption of the *ridicule*: nothing, be assured, was further from my thoughts; and if my language does convey those ideas to you, it has arisen *currente calamo*. Thou shalt "do no murder," I hold to be applicable as well to Nations as to Individuals; one cannot, but to avoid ambiguity, let me comment as I proceed; and observe, that I intend this *unfortunate* word, as used in common parlance, commit murder without being stigmatized, with as much criminality as the other; although Nations are not amenable to human punishment as individuals are: but they are liable to severe censure beyond the power of mortals; we

have but to look at the visitations with which nearly the whole Continent of Europe has been afflicted for their misdeeds. A Nation is bound to protect helpless infancy, and not authorised to suffer an infant to perish with hunger or cold, or from want of care. It is *compelled*, as you observe, to "nurse and defend him," until he is capable of defending himself; but although I admit these things. I see not that deficiency of Justice, "when he is grown up to mankind," should he carry his talents and strength elsewhere. The talents of man are bestowed upon him for his own benefit, and he may use them as to him they prove most profitable, but it should be recollected that the man of talents will not forget "gratitude" as the splendid orb illuminating those talents, which his Creator has bestowed upon him, and the Country which "reared him up to manhood." *Gratitude* will for ever remain, although I contend *allegiance* may pass away. I have it seems been unfortunate in my simile, though you will hardly allow that term to my companion; so much so have I been that I am apprehensive if I travel one step higher my attempt at elucidation may be abortive. A father of a family has more than once been compared to the head of a Government, and you will perhaps agree with me that there is *more* resemblance between the Nation and the private family, than the dependant in a family to whom in my former letter I alluded. "We naturally owe to those who gave us existence," says Blackstone, Vol. I. Chap. 16, page 453, "subjection and obedience during our minority and honour and reverence ever after;" but I do not find that this "subjection and obedience" continue after minority has ceased. When we arrive at manhood there is an end of subjection; and I consider as I have heretofore done, that as between the nation and the individual it is similar, and that nothing remains but the extension of "gratitude". Indeed, Blackstone, page 369, says, "Natural allegiance is therefore a debt of *gratitude* which cannot be forfeited;" this I have contended too and still maintain. I have insisted upon the debt of *gratitude* remaining, but not *allegiance* when a man by cession of minority becomes capable of electing his place of residence and adopting a new country if he thinks fit. I am apprehensive, that, should I adduce various other comparisons, the observations of Crousaz, in his Treatise on the Art of Thinking, Vol. I. part 1. sec. 2 page 387, would fit me, *viz*: "that a great quantity of comparisons is frequently a sign of a *superficial* wit." I had, therefore, best leave fur-

ther comparisons and rest my arguments and observations here, together with the authorities of our common lawyers quoted heretofore by me, from which it has not been my intention to depart, howsoever inexpressive and ambiguous I may have been, and with whatsoever injustice I may have communicated their sentiments, and superadded mine, satisfied with that little wit I possess, be it superficial or solid.—The Proclamation (upon which I addressed a letter to you on the 20th instant), so far as it extends is proper as I have before said; but it does not extend in my estimation as it seems to you to *all British subjects*. The word "others" bears relation to "*such* letters of naturalization," which again refers to the beginning of the sentence making mention of "mariners and seafaring men," to whom letters have been granted and to men employed on board of a ship whether as mariners and seafaring men or *otherwise*, and not to merchants, manufacturers, or fund-holders, or to his Majesty's subjects in general. I do think, Mr. Cobbett, that it would be well for this highly favoured country, if an act of parliament were passed, prohibiting lawyers from drawing up acts of parliament on pain of death, and to prevent them from expounding laws. From the extreme caution of lawyers arises all the confusion in our courts of law and the doubts upon acts of parliament; and very frequently constructions are put upon statute laws, which never entered into the imagination of the legislature.—Nations, Mr. Cobbett, have not, de jure or de facto, the power of bargaining with their infant subjects, or to become infanticides. In the one case they would act with uncontrollable injustice, in the other with turpitude. Nations are bound to extend acts of humanity and not to look to the quid pro quo; to say I have nurtured you, and I therefore claim perpetual subjection from you. It might as well be said that the common offices of humanity due to indigent foreigners lay claim to their future services in perpetuity;—the humane tendency of our laws is such that they do not suffer any person of whatever country he may be to perish through want; but yet we do not, therefore, enlist such perpetually under our banners. Acts of humanity are twice blessed, first in the adoption, and secondly in the disinterested motive. This virtue I deem the divine attribute humanized.—You know well, Mr. Cobbett, that it has been heretofore not unusual for one of two partners, British subjects, to reside in America, and the other here. The man who resided in America accepted letters of natu-

ralization, and made America his domicile. It has been not unusual for courts of law, common as well as civil, to hold, that although such a man is a natural born subject, yet having become domiciliated in America, America is his country.—Now let us see the consequence; the partner in America under cover of this construction ships to France, and, perhaps, touches here for orders, as it is termed; should such ship be brought in by our cruizers, and is libelled in the admiralty, she is released, because, although the partner in America is a natural born subject of Great Britain, yet as he is “domiciliated” there he is held to be a neutral, and the ship and cargo also neutral, notwithstanding, that the resident partner here is a British subject, and may participate in the profits of the adventure. We pay here a very liberal credit to a man’s oath, so much so, that if the British subject here *swears* he has no concern in the ship and cargo, that alone would tend to acquit the ship. A door is, however, open to perjury, and the facility with which this species of evidence, if evidence it can be called, has been received by no means tends to close the aperture. Such have been the mischievous effects of partial expatriation. I say *partial*, because should the resident partner in America chuse to return here and altogether quit his domicile abroad, he is received here again as a British subject. I think, therefore, that something more explicit and definite is requested than the language of the proclamation heretofore noticed by me. And now, Mr. Cobbett, for a short time farewell. Should you or your correspondents Candidus and R. R. incline to remark upon this and my former letters, you and they may depend upon a proper attention, on my part, as soon after the approaching “saturnalia” as possible. —S. V.—Oct. 28, 1807.

PUBLIC PAPERS.

GREAT BRITAIN AND AMERICA.—*Official Note delivered by the British Plenipotentiaries to the American Commissioners, dated December 31, 1806.*

The undersigned Henry Richard Vassall, Lord Holland, and William, Lord Auckland, Plenipotentiaries of his Britannic Majesty, have the honour to inform James Monroe and William Pinkney, Commissioners Extraordinary and Plenipotentiaries of the United States of America, that they are now ready to proceed to the signature of the treaty of amity, commerce, and navigation, on the articles of which they have mutually agreed.—But at the same time they have it in command from his Majesty, to call the at-

tention of the Commissioners of the United States, to some extraordinary proceedings which have lately taken place on the Continent of Europe, and to communicate to them officially the sentiments of his Majesty’s government thereupon.—The proceedings alluded to are certain declarations and orders of the French government, issued at Berlin, on the 21st of November last.—In those orders the French government seeks to justify or palliate its own unjust pretensions, by imputing to Great Britain principles which she never professed, and practices which never existed. His Majesty is accused of a systematic and general disregard of the law of nations, recognized by civilized states, and more particularly of an unwarrantable extension of the right of blockade; whereas his Majesty may confidently appeal to the world, on his uniform respect for neutral rights, and his general and scrupulous adherence to the law of nations, without condescending to contrast his conduct in these particulars, with that of his enemy; and with regard to the only specific charge, it is notorious, that he has never declared any ports to be in a state of blockade, without allotting to that object a force sufficient to make the entrance into them manifestly dangerous.—By such allegations, unfounded as they are, the enemy attempts to justify his pretensions of confiscating, as lawful prize, all produce of English industry or manufacture, though it be the property of neutrals; of excluding from his harbours every neutral vessel which has touched at any port of his Majesty’s dominions, though employed in an innocent commerce: and of declaring Great Britain to be in a state of blockade, though his own ports and arsenals are actually blockaded, and he is unable to station any naval force whatever before any port of the United Kingdom.—Such principles are in themselves extravagant, and repugnant to the law of nations; and the pretensions founded on them, though professedly directed solely against Great Britain, tend to alter the practice of war among civilised nations, and utterly to subvert the rights and independence of neutral powers. The undersigned cannot, therefore, believe, that the enemy will ever seriously attempt to enforce such a system. If he should, they are confident that the good sense of the American government will perceive the fatal consequences of such pretensions to neutral commerce, and that its spirit and regard to national honour, will prevent its acquiescence in such palpable violations of its rights, and injurious encroachments on its interests.—If, however, the enemy should carry these threats

into execution, and if neutral nations should, contrary to all expectation, acquiesce in such usurpations, his Majesty might probably be compelled, however reluctantly, to retaliate in his just defence, and to issue orders to his cruisers to adopt towards neutrals any hostile system to which those neutrals shall have submitted from his enemies. The commissioners of the United States will therefore feel, that at a moment when his Majesty, and all the neutral nations are threatened with such an extension of the belligerent pretensions of his enemies, he cannot enter into the stipulations of the present treaty without an explanation from the United States of their intentions, or a reservation on the part of his Majesty in the case above-mentioned, if it should ever occur.—The undersigned, considering that the distance of the American government, renders any immediate explanation on the subject impossible, and animated by a desire of forwarding the beneficial work in which they are engaged, are authorised by his Majesty to conclude the treaty without delay.—They proceed to the signature under the full persuasion that before the treaty shall be returned from America, with the ratification of the United States, the enemy will either have formally abandoned, or tacitly relinquished, his unjust pretensions, or that the government of the United States, by its conduct or assurances, will have given security to his Majesty, that it will not submit to such innovations in the established system of maritime law; and the undersigned have presented this note from an anxious wish, that it should be clearly understood on both sides, that without such abandonment of his pretensions, on the part of the enemy, or such assurances or such conduct on the part of the United States, his Majesty will not consider himself bound by the present signature of his commissioners to ratify the treaty, or precluded from adopting such measures as may seem necessary for counteracting the designs of his enemy whenever they shall occur, and be of such an extraordinary nature as to require extraordinary remedies.—The undersigned cannot conclude, without expressing their satisfaction at the prospect of accomplishing an object so important to the interests and friendly connection of both nations, and their just sense of the conciliatory disposition manifested by the commissioners of the United States, during the whole course of the negotiation.

(Signed) VASSAL HOLLAND.

AUCKLAND.

RUSSIA AND TURKEY.—*Treaty of Armistice between Russia and the Ottoman Porte; August 24, 1807.*

Art. 1. From the date of the signature of the treaty, all hostilities shall cease between the two belligerent powers.—2. As the Sublime Porte and Russia equally wish, with the most amicable intention, the establishment of peace and harmony, the high contracting parties will appoint, after the signature of the present armistice, plenipotentiaries to negotiate and conclude a peace as soon as possible, to meet in the most convenient situation for both. If in the course of the negotiation for a definitive peace, difficulties should unfortunately arise, so as to obstruct a definitive arrangement, hostilities shall not re-commence before next spring, that is to say, before the 21st of March, 1808, new stile of the christian æra.—3. As soon as the present armistice is signed, the Russian troops shall begin to evacuate Wallachia and Moldavia, and all the provinces, fortresses, and other territory which they have occupied during the war; and to retire within their ancient frontiers, so that the said evacuation shall be completed in the space of thirty-five days from the date of the signature of the present armistice.—The Russian troops shall leave, in the territory and fortresses which they shall evacuate all the effects, cannon, and ammunition, which they found on taking possession of them. The Sublime Porte shall appoint commissaries to receive the aforesaid fortresses from Russian officers appointed for the aforesaid purpose. The Ottoman troops shall, in like manner, retire from Moldavia and Wallachia, and repass the Danube. They will only leave in the fortresses of Ismail, Brailow, and Giurgion, garrisons sufficient to keep them. The Russian troops shall correspond with the Ottomans, so that the two armies shall begin to retire at the same time from Wallachia and Moldavia. The two contracting parties shall in no way meddle with the administration of the two principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia till the arrival of the plenipotentiaries charged with the office of negotiating for a definitive peace. Till peace is concluded, the Ottoman troops shall not enter any of the fortresses evacuated by the Russians. The inhabitants alone shall be at liberty to enter them.—4. Conformably to the preceding article, the island of Tenedos, as well as every other place in the Archipelago, which, before the intelligence of the armistice shall have arrived, shall be occupied by the Russian troops, shall be evacuated. The Rus-

sian troops which are stationed before Tenedos, or any other place in the Archipelago, shall return to their ports, in order that the Dardanelles shall be at once open and free. If the Russian ships in proceeding to their ports shall be obliged to stop at any port in the Archipelago, in consequence of tempestuous weather, or any other unavoidable accident, the Turkish officers shall not oppose any obstacle, but on the contrary, shall afford them the necessary aid. All the ships of war, or other Ottoman vessels, which, during the war shall have fallen into the hands of the Russians, shall be restored, with their crews, as well as the Russian vessels which shall have fallen into the hands of the Ottomans. The Russian ships in proceeding to their ports shall not take on board any subject of the Sublime Porte.—5. All the vessels of the Russian flotilla stationed at the mouth of the Sunne or elsewhere, shall go out and proceed to their ports, in order that the Ottoman vessels may go out and come in with perfect safety. The Sublime Porte will give orders that the Russian vessels proceeding to their ports shall be respected, and that they shall be permitted to enter into any Ottoman port in case they shall be obliged to do so by tempestuous weather or any other inevitable accident.—6. All the prisoners of war and other slaves of both sexes, of whatever quality or rank, shall be immediately liberated and restored on both sides, without any ransom, with the exception, however, of mussulmen who shall have voluntarily embraced the christian religion in the Russian empire, and the christian subjects of Russia who shall have voluntarily embraced the mahometan religion in the Ottoman empire. Immediately after the conclusion of the present armistice, all the commanders, officers and inhabitants of the fortresses of Turkey, who are at present in Russia, shall be restored and sent to Turkey, with all their property and baggage.—7. The present treaty of armistice, written in Turkish and in French, has been signed by the two plenipotentiaries, and by the Adjutant Commandant Guilleminot, and has been exchanged, in order that it may be ratified by the Grand Vizier, and by his excellency the General in Chief Michelson.—The two plenipotentiaries shall take care that the said ratifications shall be exchanged within one week, or sooner, if possible.—Done and decreed at the castle of Slobosia, near Giurgion, the 20th of the month of Dgemazial-Ahir, the year of the Hegira 1222, and the 12th of August (old style), or the 24th of August, 1807, (new style) of

the Christian æra. — (Signed) — GALIB EFFENDI, SERGIO LASKAROFF, GUILLEMINOT.

FOREIGN OFFICIAL PAPER.

RUSSIA.—*Proclamation issued by the Emperor of Russia, on the conclusion of Peace with France. Given at St. Petersburg, August 9, 1807.*

We, Alexander the First, by God's grace, Emperor and Autocrat of all the Russias.—The war between Russia and France, through the powerful assistance of the Most High, and the distinguished valour of our troops, has ended. Peace is happily restored.—In the course of this war, Russia has experienced the magnitude of her resources in the love and devotion of her sons, and which she may reckon upon finding on all occasions.—The troops in general have exhibited an unexampled valour, the firmest intrepidity, and heroic action; wherever they were called by the voice of honour, the sense of danger disappeared: their glorious deeds will remain beyond the power of oblivion in the annals of national honour, and a grateful country will consider them as standing examples for posterity.—The nobles of the civil class, treading in the footsteps of their predecessors, have not only distinguished themselves by the sacrifices they have made of their property, but also by their perfect readiness to hazard their lives for the honour of their country.—The merchants, and all the other classes, neither sparing of their endeavours nor their property, have cheerfully borne the burden of the war, and have shewn themselves ready to make any sacrifice whatever.—With such a general and intimate union of valour and patriotism, it has pleased the Most High, defending and strengthening our armies in the severest conflicts, finally to reward their intrepidity by putting a happy period to a sanguinary war, and presenting us with a propitious peace, by a treaty, between France and Russia, which was concluded and ratified on the 27th of June, in our presence, at Tilsit.—According to the basis of this treaty, we have rejected all the plans for the enlargement of our frontiers at the expense of our allies, as inconsistent with justice and Russian dignity.—Not wishing to extend our spacious empire, we only made use of our arms to restore the violated tranquillity of the Continent, and to avert the danger which threatened our own, and the states that were in alliance with us.—Through the establishment of the present peace, Russia's ancient limits are not only secured in their

complete inviolability, but rendered more complete by the addition of a natural and advantageous line of frontier.—Several countries and provinces have been given up to our allies, which had been lost by the fortune of war, and subjected by force of arms.—Peace being concluded upon these principles, we are convinced that all our faithful subjects will join with us in offering their prayers to the throne of the King of Kings, that Russia may long enjoy its advantages, defended by the blessings of the Supreme, and the unshaken and tried valour of her armies — Given at St. Petersburg, Aug. 9, 1807, and the seventh year of our reign.—(L. S.) ALEXANDER. ANDREI BUDBERG.

PORTUGAL.—*Proclamation of the Prince Regent of Portugal: given at the Palace of Mafra, Oct. 20, 1807.*

It having been my greatest desire to preserve within my dominions the most perfect neutrality during the present war, upon the good account of the acknowledged good effects that result from it to the subjects of this Crown; but it being impossible to preserve it any longer, and reflecting at the same time how beneficial a general peace will be to humanity, I have judged it proper to accede to the cause of the Continent, by uniting myself to His Majesty the Emperor of the French and King of Italy, and to His Catholic Majesty, in order to contribute, as far as may be in my power, to the acceleration of a maritime peace, wherefore I am pleased to order, that the ports of this kingdom may be shut against the entry of all ships of war and merchant vessels belonging to Great Britain; and thus it is to be understood.—Given at the Palace of Mafra, the 20th of October, 1807. By order of the Prince Regent, our Sovereign.—That all persons may have due notice, it is directed that this Edict be publicly affixed.—J. F. LUDOVIC. Lisbon, Oct 22, 1807.

DOMESTIC OFFICIAL PAPERS.

MASSACRE AT VELLORE.—*Proclamation relative to the Massacre at Vellore: published by Order of the Governor in Council, and dated Fort St. George, December 3, 1806.*

The right hon. the Governor in Council, having observed that in some late instances an extraordinary degree of agitation has prevailed among several corps of the Native Army of this coast, it has been his lordship's particular endeavour to ascertain the motives which may have led to conduct so different from that which formerly distinguished the Native Army. From this

inquiry, it has appeared, that many persons of evil intention have endeavoured, for malicious purposes, to impress upon the native troops a belief that it is the wish of the British government to convert them by forcible means to Christianity; and his lordship in Council has observed with concern that such malicious reports have been believed by many of the native troops.—The right hon. the Governor in Council therefore deems it proper in this public manner to repeat to the native troops his assurance, that the same respect which has been invariably shewn by the British government for their religion and for their customs, will be always continued; and that no interruption will be given to any native, whether Hindoo or Mussulman, in the practice of his religious ceremonies.—His lordship in Council desires that the native troops will not give belief to the idle rumours which are circulated by enemies of their happiness, who endeavour, with the basest designs, to weaken the confidence of the troops in the British government. His lordship in Council desires that the native troops will remember the constant attention and humanity which have been shewn by the British government, in providing for their comfort, by augmenting the pay of the native officers and Sepoys; by allowing liberal pensions to those who have done their duty faithfully; by making ample provision for the families of those who may have died in battle; and by receiving their children into the service of the hon. Company, to be treated with the same care and bounty as their fathers had experienced.—The right hon. the Governor in Council trusts that the native troops, remembering these circumstances, will be sensible of the happiness of their situation, which is greater than what the troops of any other part of the world enjoy, and that they will continue to observe the same good conduct for which they were distinguished in the days of General Lawrence, of Sir Eyre Coote, and of other renowned heroes.—The native troops must, at the same time, be sensible, that if they should fail in the duties of their allegiance, and should shew themselves disobedient to their officers, their conduct will not fail to receive merited punishment, as the British government is not less prepared to punish the guilty, than to protect and distinguish those who are deserving of its favour.—It is directed that this paper be translated with care into the Tamul, Telinga, and Hindoostany languages; and that copies of it be circulated to each native battalion, of which the European officers are enjoined and ordered to be careful in making it known

to every native officer and Sepoy under his command.—It is also directed that copies of the paper be circulated to all the magistrates and collectors under this government, for the purpose of being fully understood in all parts of the country.—Published by order of the right hon. the Governor in Council. G. BUCHAN, Chief Sec. to Government.

GIBRALTAR.—*Order relative to Foreigners ; residing in Gibraltar, dated Head Quarters, October 8, 1807.*

Notice having been received from the officers commanding the Spanish lines, that in consequence of orders from the Court, the communication is closed between Spain and the Fortress; it is hereby ordered and directed, that all subjects of His Most Catholic Majesty, and of all countries under the dominion of France, residing within this place, leave the same with the least possible delay.—It is further ordered, that all Aliens, or Foreigners, not actually in the employ of some one or other of the departments of Government, or in that of British merchants, or long-established inhabitants of this place, do also quit the town and territory within 20 days from the present date, unless they shall have obtained, previous to that period, Permits of Residence of a date subsequent to the present. And it is to be clearly understood, in future, that all persons by whose application, or under whose responsibility, strangers are suffered to reside in this garrison, are to be responsible for their maintenance, as well as for their good conduct.—All persons whatsoever in the several departments of Government, to whom the same may appertain, shall do their utmost to put these orders in force.—By Command.—(Signed) R. WRIGHT, Secretary.

EVACUATION OF ZEALAND.—*From the Supplement to the London Gazette of Saturday, October 31. Dated Downing street, Oct. 31, 1807.*

A Dispatch, of which the following is an Extract, has been received from Lieut. Gen. the Right Hon. Lord Cathcart, K. T. addressed to Lord Castlereagh, one of his Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, dated on board his Majesty's ship *Africaine*, the 21st Oct. 1807.

As no sort of infraction of the Capitulation had been made by the Danes, who, on the contrary, acted most honourably in the strict and literal fulfilment of their engagement; with a view to the fulfilment of the Articles of the Capitulation on our part, it

was decided to commence the embarkation of the army on Tuesday, the 13th instant.—Accordingly, on that day, the 8 battalions of the line of the King's German Legion, were embarked in the arsenal; and, on the 14th, the 2 light battalions of the King's German Legion, together with Brigadier Gen. Macfarlane's brigade, viz. the 7th and 8th regiments of British, which embarked in the same ships which brought them from Hull. These corps, with the depot and garrison company of the legion, and the sick and wounded of the army, completely occupied all the troop ships, whether for home or foreign service, which had not been appropriated to the conveyance of naval stores.—These ships having been removed to the road, were replaced by the horse ships.—On the same day the advanced posts were withdrawn from Kollhaven, Werdenberg, Corsøer, Kallenberg, Fredericksberg, Hersholm, and adjacents, and proceeding through a chain of cavalry posts, reached the environs of Copenhagen in three marches.—The embarkation of the royal artillery, with the field and battering ordnance, having been gradually carried on from the Kalk Brauderie, that of the cavalry and foreign artillery in the dock-yard, and that of the British regiments from the citadel, to the men of war, there remained on shore, on Sunday afternoon, the 18th instant, only the brigade of guards, who moved on that day from the palace of Fredericksberg, to the strand near Hellerup, with one brigade of British light artillery, the flank companies of the 32d and 50th regiments, with the 82d regiment, under Major Gen. Spencer, in the arsenal; and the 4th regiment, with a detachment of the royal artillery in the citadel, under Lieut. Col. Wynch, who acted as Lieut. Governor, the 4th, or King's own regiment, having been in garrison there the whole time.—Lieut. Gen. Sir G. Ludlow was appointed to command the rear guard of the army. In the evening of the 18th, a gale of wind came on which lasted 24 hours, and rendered further embarkation impossible, and any communication from the shore with the ships very difficult. As soon as it became evident that the evacuation of the island, on the 19th, was impracticable, a correspondence took place between the British and Danish head quarters, the result of which left no reason to apprehend that hostilities would recommence on either side at the expiration of the term, although the Danish General protested, in strong terms, against our retaining the citadel, which, on the other hand, it was not judged expedient to evacuate.—On the 20th the morning was calm, and, as soon as it was

light, the drums of all his Majesty's regiments on shore beat the General; and the dock-yard and harbour being entirely cleared of transports and British vessels, the corps commanded by Major Gen. Spencer rowed out of the arsenal, under the guns of the citadel, and proceeded along the shore to Hellerup, to be in readiness to reinforce the guards. His Majesty's sloop Rosamond having been also towed out of the harbour, and the King's ships within reach of the Three Crown Battery, having got under weigh, the 4th regiment marched out of the citadel, and proceeded to join the guards, covered by its own flank companies, and by a picquet of the guards.—As soon as they had marched, the bridge was drawn up, and the British Fort Adjutant was sent to the Danish head quarters, to acquaint the General, that he was at liberty to send a guard to take charge of the citadel; accordingly, a small detachment of the royal artillery, and of the 4th regiment, were relieved by a guard of Danish troops, and the ordnance inventories and keys having been given over to the officers appointed to receive them by Major Bodecker, the Fort Major, and Capt. Patterson, of the royal artillery, the British detachment embarked with those officers, at the citadel, and proceeded to Hellerup.—As soon as the 4th regt. had joined the guards, Lieut. Gen. Sir G. Ludlow began the embarkation, which was completed with great expedition and regularity. No troops of the enemy appeared, and there was no concourse of inhabitants. People of all ranks in the city, in the villages, and on the public road, were extremely civil. Had any disturbance been intended, or had any been accidentally excited, the embarkation would have been equally secure from insult, the place selected being open and level, and out of the range of fire from the Crown Battery or Citadel, but commanded by his Majesty's light ships of war.—The brow, or stage itself, from which the troops embarked, was judiciously and ingeniously contrived by Sir Home Popham, to answer equally the purposes of embarkation and defence. A small vessel, a praam, and a floating battery, were fastened successively to each other on the beach; the two first being planked over, and the last beyond them having several guns of large calibre prepared for action, in an oblique direction, and manned by seamen.—The flat boats drew up on the two sides of the praam, and the gun-boats, which also received troops, were placed beyond the floating battery, so that, as soon as the brigade of artillery was embarked, the troops marched to their boats, and the whole put off to their

respective ships; after which the floating battery and praam were destroyed.

Admiralty Office, Oct. 31, 1807.—Copy of a letter from Admiral Gambier to the Hon. William Wellesley Pole, dated on board his Majesty's ship the Prince of Wales, off Copenhagen, Oct. 20, 1807.

Sir;—I have the honour to acquaint you, for the information of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, that the whole of the Danish fleet being equipped (except two unserviceable ships of the line and two frigates, which have been destroyed), and the arsenal cleared of the stores, the army has been re-embarked; and that I shall proceed, with the first favourable wind, to carry into execution the instructions I have received from the Lord Viscount Castlereagh.—Having so far accomplished the service on which I have been employed, I feel it my duty to state the great activity, energy, and zeal, which have been shewn by Vice Admiral Stanhope and Rear Admiral Sir Samuel Hood, in superintending the equipment of the Danish ships, and the embarkation of the stores from the arsenal; nor has the same spirit been less manifest in the captains, officers, seamen, and marines, who have all executed their respective parts, in the general exertion, with a promptitude and alacrity, which has not only entitled them to my warmest thanks and praise, but will, I doubt not, when the aggregate result of their labour is considered, obtain for them the approbation of their sovereign, and the applause of the nation.—In the space of 6 weeks, 16 sail of the line, 9 frigates, 14 sloops of war and smaller vessels, besides gun boats, have been fitted for sea, and all the large ships laden with masts, spars, timber, and other stores, from the arsenal, from whence also 92 cargoes have been shipped on board transports, and other vessels chartered for the purpose, the sum of whose burden exceeds 20,000 tons. A considerable number of masts and spars have been put on board the Leyden and Inflexible, which were well adapted for this purpose, and some valuable stores on board his Majesty's ships; nor can I forbear to remark, that such was the emulation among the several ships of the fleet to which the Danish ships were respectively attached for equipment, that within 9 days 14 sail of the line were brought out of the harbour, although several of them underwent, in our hands, considerable repairs. Of the 3 ships on the stocks, two have been taken to pieces, and the useful parts of their timbers brought away; and the third, being in a considerable state of forwardness, was

sawed in various parts, and suffered to fall over.—On a review of the whole, I think it may be asserted, without derogating from the merit of any former service, that the characteristic activity of British officers, seamen, and marines, was never more zealously exerted than on this occasion; but I must not omit, at the same time, to inform their lordships, that a very considerable proportion of the labour of the arsenal has been performed, with equal zeal and energy, by large working parties from the army, whose exertions entitle them to the same praise.—I beg leave to express the great satisfaction I have felt from the zealous and attentive services of Rear Admiral Essington, to whom the general superintendence of the numerous transports, and the re-embarkation of the army, with all its artillery and stores, has been committed.—I embrace this opportunity to make a particular acknowledgment of the very able and judicious dispositions which Rear Admiral Keats has made, from time to time, of the force under his command, for guarding the Belt; and the vigilant attention which his whole squadron have paid to this important branch of the service.—Sir Home Popham has not ceased to manifest his usual zeal and ability in the assistance he has rendered me in the various services of the fleet; and I should not do justice to the diligent attention and arduous endeavours of Captain Mackenzie, to fulfil the civil duties of the arsenal, which were committed to his management and superintendence, if I did not, on this occasion, express my warm approbation of his exertions, and I beg leave to recommend him to their lordships' favourable notice.—I have the honour to transmit herewith a list of the Danish ships and vessels which have been brought away, and of those destroyed. The account of the stores shipped from the arsenal shall also be sent, as soon as the several returns can be collected and arranged.—I have the honour to be, &c. (Signed) J GAMBIEB.—[The list of the Danish ships will be found at p. 480.]

ITALIAN STATES.—*Order for issuing Letters of Marque against the Italian States under the influence of France. Given at the Court at the Queen's Palace, the 4th Nov. 1807; present, the King's Most Excellent Majesty in Council.*

Whereas France has taken forcible possession of certain territories and ports in Italy, and in the Mediterranean and Adriatic seas, and has subverted their ancient governments, and erected, in the room thereof, new governments, which, under her influence,

are aiding in the execution of her hostile designs against the property, commerce, and navigation of his Majesty's subjects; and whereas divers acts, injurious to the just rights of his Majesty, and to the interests of his kingdom, have in consequence been committed; his Majesty is pleased, by and with the advice of his privy council, to order, and it is hereby ordered, that general reprisals be granted against the ships, goods, and inhabitants, of the territories and ports of Tuscany, the kingdom of Naples, the port and territory of Ragusa, and those of the Islands lately composing the Republic of the Seven Islands, and all other ports and places in the Mediterranean and Adriatic seas, which are occupied by the arms of France or her allies, so that as well his Majesty's fleets and ships, as also all other ships and vessels that shall be commissioned by letters of marque or general reprisals, or otherwise, by his Majesty's Commissioners for executing the office of Lord High Admiral of Great Britain, shall and may lawfully seize all ships, vessels, and goods, belonging to the said territories, ports, and places, or to any persons being subjects or inhabitants thereof, and bring the same to judgment in such Courts of Admiralty within his Majesty's dominions, as shall be duly commissioned to take cognizance thereof; and, to that end, his Majesty's Advocate General, with the Advocate of the Admiralty, are forthwith to prepare the draft of a commission, and present the same to his Majesty at this Board, authorising the Commissioners for executing the office of Lord High Admiral, or any person or persons by them empowered and appointed, to issue forth and grant letters of marque and reprisals to any of his Majesty's subjects, or others whom the said commissioners shall deem fitly qualified in that behalf, for the apprehending, seizing, and taking, the ships, vessels, and goods, belonging to the said territories, ports, and places, or to any persons being subjects or inhabitants thereof; and that such powers and clauses be inserted in the said commission as have been usual, and are according to former precedents; and his Majesty's Advocate General, with the Advocate of the Admiralty, are also forthwith to prepare the draft of a commission, and present the same to his Majesty at this Board, authorising the said commissioners for executing the office of Lord High Admiral, to will and require the High Court of Admiralty of Great Britain, and the lieutenant and judge of the said court, his surrogate or surrogates, as also the several Courts of Admiralty within his Majesty's dominions, to take cognizance of, and judicially proceed upon,

all and all manner of captures, seizures, prizes, and reprisals, of all ships and goods that are or shall be taken, and to hear and determine the same, and, according to the course of Admiralty, and the Laws of Nations, to adjudge and condemn all such ships, vessels, and goods, as shall belong to the said territories, ports, and places, or to any persons being subjects or inhabitants thereof; and that such powers and clauses be inserted in the said commission as have been usual, and are according to former precedents; and they are likewise to prepare, and lay before his Majesty at this Board, a draft of such instructions as may be proper to be sent to the Courts of Admiralty in his Majesty's foreign governments and plantations, for their guidance herein; as also another draft of instructions for such ships as shall be commissioned for the purpose abovementioned.—

Eldon, C. Camden, P. Westmorland, C. P. S. Winchelsea. Cathcart. Hawkesbury. Mulgrave. Sp. Perceval. Nat. Bond.

DENMARK.—*Order for issuing Letters of Marque against Denmark. Given at the Court at the Queen's Palace, the 4th Nov. 1807; Present, the King's Most Excellent Majesty in Council.*

Whereas the King of Denmark has issued a Declaration of War against his Majesty, his subjects and people; and his Majesty's anxious and repeated endeavour to obtain the revocation of such declaration, and to procure the restoration of peace, have proved ineffectual; his Majesty therefore is pleased, by and with the advice of his Privy Council, to order, and it is hereby ordered, that general reprisals be granted against the ships, goods, and subjects of the King of Denmark, (save and except any vessels to which his Majesty's license has been granted, or which have been directed to be released from the embargo, and have not since arrived at any foreign port,) so that as well his Majesty's fleets and ships, as also all other ships and vessels that shall be commissioned by letters of marque or general reprisals, or otherwise, by his Majesty's commissioners for executing the office of Lord High Admiral of Great Britain, shall and may lawfully seize all ships, vessels, and goods, belonging to the King of Denmark, or his subjects, or others inhabiting within the territories of the King of Denmark, and bring the same to judgment in any of the Courts of Admiralty within his Majesty's dominions; and, to that end, his Majesty's

Advocate-General, with the Advocate of the Admiralty, are forthwith to prepare the draft of a commission, and present the same to his Majesty at this board, authorising the commissioners for executing the office of Lord High Admiral, or any person or persons of them empowered and appointed, to issue forth and grant letters of marque and reprisals to any of his Majesty's subjects, or others whom the said commissioners shall deem fitly qualified in that behalf, for the apprehending, seizing, and taking the ships, vessels, and goods belonging to Denmark, and the vassals and subjects of the King of Denmark, or any inhabiting within his countries, territories, or dominions, (except as aforesaid,) and that such powers and clauses be inserted in the said commission as have been usual, and are according to former precedents; and his Majesty's Advocate General, with the Advocate of the Admiralty, are also forthwith to prepare the draft of a commission, and present the same to his Majesty at this board, authorising the said commissioners for executing the office of Lord High Admiral, to will and require the High Court of Admiralty of Great-Britain, and the Lieutenant and Judge of the said Court, his Surrogate or Surrogates, as also the several Courts of Admiralty within his Majesty's dominions, to take cognizance of, and judicially proceed upon, all and all manner of captures, seizures, prizes, and reprisals of all ships and goods that are or shall be taken, and to hear and determine the same, and, according to the course of Admiralty, and the Laws of Nations, to adjudge and condemn all such ships, vessels, and goods, as shall belong to Denmark, or the vassals and subjects of the King of Denmark, or to any others inhabiting within any of his countries, territories, and dominions, (except as aforesaid;) and that such powers and clauses be inserted in the said commission as have been usual, and are according to former precedents; and they are likewise to prepare, and lay before his Majesty at this board, a draft of such instructions as may be proper to be sent to the Courts of Admiralty in his Majesty's foreign governments and plantations, for their guidance herein; as also another draft of instructions for such ships as shall be commissioned for the purpose abovementioned.—
C. ELTON, P. CAMDEN, C. P. S. WESTMORLAND, WINCHELSEA, CATHCART, HAWKESBURY, MULGRAVE, SPEN. PERCEVAL, NAT. BOND.